Vol. XXXIII. JULY, 1956. No. 3

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance,* 15/-.

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn — Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. J. O'Connor, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Dubbo, N.S.W.
Diocese of Bunbury—V. Rev. C. Cunningham, Dardanup, W.A.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Cathedral, Geraldton, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Adm., Wangaratta, V.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—Rt. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Albury, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes — Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.
Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 183
Encyclical Letter on the Sacred Heart.

THE BASIC VIRTUE,
Right Rev. Mgr. Cornelius Roberts, D.D., Ph.D. 207

"EXCEPT IT BE FOR FORNICATION": A suggested interpretation .. .. .. Rev. Thomas Considine, M.A., P.P. 214

MARY, THE UNIVERSAL DISPENSER OF GRACES,
Rev. Augustine Regan, C.SS.R., S.T.D. 224

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY .. .. Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D. 239
Doctrinal Aspects of the Sunday.

MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 246
Faculties for priests' confessions—Questions on Sunday obligation and Eucharistic Fast—A qualified contract—First communion of children of careless parents.

CANON LAW .. .. .. Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, D.C.L. 257
Canon 637 and sick religious.

LITURGY .. .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 263
Preaching before the Blessed Sacrament exposed.

HOMILETICS .. .. Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 271
Charity in action.

NOTES 278
The Piltdown Forgery (Rev. Francis Mecham, M.A.).

BOOK REVIEWS 284
Neglected Saints (Watkin); The Mystical Rose (Newman); History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages (Gilson); What Catholics Believe (Pieper and Raskop); The Congregation of Sacred Rites (McManus); The Betrothal Contract in the Code of Canon Law (Wrzaszczak); The Western Dilemma (Smith); The Mongol Mission (Ed. Dawson); Hilaire Belloc: No Alienated Man (Wilhelmsen) [p. 245].

SHORT NOTICES 238, 256, 262

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Sydneyi, 1a die Julii, 1956.

Official Documents

ENCYCLICAL LETTER ON THE SACRED HEART.

["Haurietis aquas," May 15, 1956. A.A.S., Vol. 48, pp. 309-353]

Summary.

As a full translation of this copious Encyclical would require close on thirty of our pages, we are compelled to summarize it, at about half the original length. It consists of an introduction and five sections, without headings.

Introduction.

The Holy Father begins with a citation of the words of Isaias: "You shall draw waters in joy from the fountains of the Saviour" (12 : 3). He notes that the occasion of the first centenary of the extension of the Feast of the Sacred Heart to the Universal Church by Pius IX (Aug. 23, 1856) recalls the magnificent images here presented by the Prophet, images of gifts manifold and abundant.

Really the benefits which the cultus of the Sacred Heart of Jesus has conferred on the Church are innumerable. They call for thanks to heaven, in the first place, since, as St. James wisely pointed out: "Every best gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights" (1 : 17). Through this wonderful cultus and devotion the spouse of Christ can realize more and more that abundance of supernatural life promised by Christ, on the occasion of which we read in St. John's Gospel: "On the last great day of the feast Jesus was standing, and he cried out saying: If anyone is thirsty, let him come to me and let him who believes in me drink. From within him there shall flow torrents of living water. This he said of the Spirit which those were to receive who would believe in him" (Jn. 7 : 37-39).

Divine charity, it must be remembered, has its first origin from the Holy Spirit, who is the personal Love of the Father and the Son in the bosom of the August Trinity. The Apostle echoes to the words of Christ when he says: "The love of God is diffused in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us" (Rom. 5 : 5).

This close connection which the Scriptures declare to exist between that divine charity which should burn in the hearts of christians and the Holy Spirit, who is Himself Love, points to the special nature of the cultus of the Sacred Heart. This excellent form of religion, as is well known, demands a full and absolute will of self-dedication and con-

secration to the love of the Divine Redeemer. Of His love His wounded Heart is a living demonstration and sign; it calls for a return of love in response to the Divine Love. Indeed, it is only by force of charity that the souls of men become fully and perfectly subject to the dominion of the Deity, for the affection of love tends to the union described by the Apostle in the words: "He who adheres to the Lord is one spirit" (I Cor., 6 : 17).

I.

The Pope deprecates the neglect which some christians and even devout people show towards the triumphant cultus of the Heart of Jesus. Certain prejudices have led such people and still lead them to a false estimation of this inestimable devotion. They consider it unsuitable and even detrimental in view of the general needs of our time. Some, identifying the devotion with practices of piety approved and fostered by the Church, but not imposed by her, think that the cultus of the Sacred Heart is an optional extra; others think it a burden and of little use to those who are exerting all their energies and using all available means for the defence and spread of Catholic truth, for the diffusion of Catholic social principles, and the promotion of religious institutions and works; others go further and dare to think that this form of piety has little moral value, as being sentimental and rather suited to women than to men of strong intellectual formation.

The fact that devotion to the Sacred Heart demands penance, expiation and other virtues, which some call "passive," leads certain persons, who are always looking for external results, to the conclusion that this form of piety does not fit into the programme of the public and strenuous activity now required in order to secure the triumph of Catholic faith and christian morality. They think this is not the devotion for days when people are so much prone to regard one religion as good as another, to deny the difference between true and false, and to succumb to infection by materialism or laicism.

Positions like these are obviously in contradiction with the approval and praise given by the Popes to the cultus of the Sacred Heart. Leo XIII called it "a most highly-approved and praiseworthy form of religion," and considered that it was a powerful remedy for the evils of our time. Praising it, he said: "The multitude of evils so long afflicting mankind demand that the help of one helper be sought, by whose power they may be driven out. And who is that helper but Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten of God? No other name has been given to

men under heaven, in whom we must be saved." To Him we must fly who is "the way, the truth and the life" ("Annum Sacrum," 25 May, 1899).

Not less clearly did Pope Pius XI express himself in the Encyclical "Miserentissimus Redemptor" of May 8, 1928: "Is not the whole sum of religion and the rule of a perfect life contained in this form of piety? It leads more easily and efficaciously to an intimate knowledge of Christ our Lord, to a more intense love of Him, and to a closer imitation of His life."

From his first Encyclical of Oct. 20, 1939, Pius XII has shown his deep interest in the growth of devotion to the Sacred Heart, welcoming new Associations and the production of literature about the devotion. He has shown this interest especially through the praise which he has bestowed on the Apostleship of Prayer. Many of his radio messages touch on this subject. Coming after many such manifestations the present Encyclical is justly regarded as a splendid crown on all that His Holiness has hitherto done to promote this excellent form of cultus and devotion.

The Encyclical is intended to recall the principles from the Bible, the Fathers and from Catholic Theology, on which devotion to the Sacred Heart is founded. The Scriptural foundations are sought even in the pages of the Old Testament. After a brief but impressive statement that this devotion is devotion to the Word Incarnate and to His infinite love, as symbolized by the Heart, the series of biblical testimonies begins.

The Mosaic Pact, it is observed, was not exclusively a pact insisting on God's dominion, portraying Him as an austere Lord, and on a corresponding servile subjection on the part of the Chosen People. Charity was inscribed in its fundamental statute: "Hear, o Israel: the Lord is our God, the Lord is One. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with all thy strength. And these words, which I command you to-day, shall be upon thy heart (Deut. 6 : 4-6).

Hence it is not surprising that the imagery of filial and conjugal affection is used by Moses and the Prophets, rather than the severe images of lordship and servitude, to signify the relations between God and His people. From Moses we have the beautiful simile of the Eagle solicitous for its young (Deut. 32 : 11). Amongst the Prophets, Osee is a Preacher of most intimate affection. He constantly represents God

as a most loving, merciful Father or as an offended husband whose chief purpose, in punishing the crimes of Israel, is to bring back the ungrateful people to His divine friendship: "I will draw him with the cords of Adam, with the bonds of love" (Cfr. Os. 11, 3-45; 14 : 5-6). Isaias, also, in the form of a dialogue between God and his people, hears the Almighty say: "Even if a mother should forget her child, yet will I not forget thee." The language of the Canticle of canticles shows most clearly the utter warmth of the divine love for Israel. It abounds in such sentences as: "My beloved to me, and I to my beloved" (Cant. 6 : 2).

The tender, indulgent and patient love of God thus manifested in the pages of the Old Testament, as a pre-announcement of the love of the Redeemer and of His most loving Heart, culminates, in a certain way, in Jeremias, who opens up the secret of the new interior law of the Christian Covenant: "with perpetual love I have loved thee; therefore did I draw thee in mercy .... Behold the days shall come, says the Lord, and I will conclude with the House of Israel and with the House of Juda a new alliance....This is the alliance which I will make with the House of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and in their heart I will write it; and I will be their God and they shall be my people...because I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (Jer. XXXI).

II.

No Prophet, however, gave more than a faint image of the richness of the mystery which makes the New Covenant. The surpassing nobility of this new alliance is shown, in the first place, by the fact that its sanction was not in the blood of sheep and goats, but in the blood of that Divine Victim whom those pacific victims prefigured—"the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world."

Certainly, the Christian Covenant, much more than the Old, most evidently rests not on servitude and fear, but on the friendship existing between father and son. It is consequently maintained and strengthened by a more abundant outpouring of grace and truth: "of his fulness we all received, and grace upon grace. For the Law was given through Moses, but grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (Jn. I : 16-17).

This sentence of the beloved Disciple, who leaned on the breast of Jesus at the Supper, leads us into the mystery of the infinite charity of the Word Incarnate. It is, therefore, good to meditate on it, so that we may measure up to the desire of the Apostle of the Gentiles: "having

Christ dwelling by faith in our hearts, being rooted and founded in charity, so as to be able to understand with all the saints, what is the breadth and length and height and depth; to know also the charity of Christ which surpasses all knowledge, and thus to be filled to the whole fulness of God" (Eph. 3 : 17-19).

The Mystery of Redemption is primarily and basically a mystery of love. It is the mystery of the just love of Christ—His love of justice towards the Eternal Father to Whom as Redeemer He offered, with a loving and obedient soul, the sacrifice of the Cross, as a copious and infinite satisfaction due for the sins of the human race. It is also a mystery of merciful love—a mystery of a love of mercy on the part of the August Trinity and the Divine Redeemer towards all men, since they were quite unable of themselves to expiate their sins. Only Christ was able, through the unsearchable riches of His merits and the outpouring of His Precious Blood, to renew and consummate that alliance of friendship between God and men first violated in the terrestrial Paradise and subsequently by the innumerable sins of the Chosen People. By the Divine Redeemer, as sole lawful and perfect Mediator, in virtue of His boundless love, a wonderful conciliation between justice and mercy was achieved. Of this mystery of our salvation St. Thomas says admirably: "The deliverance of man through the Passion of Christ befitted both the justice and the mercy of God—His justice, because, by His Passion, Christ satisfied for the sin of mankind, and thus man was delivered through the justice of Christ—His mercy, because, man not being able to satisfy by himself for the sin of all human nature, God gave as 'satisfactor' His own Son. This was a way of greater mercy than if He had forgiven sin without any satisfaction" (S.T. 3, q. 46, a. 1 ad 3).

For the further understanding (as far as mortals can understand) of the length and breadth and height and depth of the mysterious charity of the Word Incarnate towards His heavenly Father and towards sin-infected mankind, all the characteristics of His love must be considered.

God's love is entirely spiritual. Such was the love with which the Creator loved our first parents and the Hebrew people. However familiar or paternal the expressions of that love may be in the Psalms and the Prophets and the Canticle, they signify a purely spiritual love. On the other hand, the love which exhales from the Gospel, the Epistles and the pages of the Apocalypse—from all pages that describe the love

of Jesus Christ—is not only a spiritual but also a human love. The humanity of Christ was not fictitious or imaginary, as those Gnostics condemned by St. John would have it, but a real human nature, individual, integral and perfect, formed by the Holy Spirit in the virginal womb of Mary. This human nature of Christ had everything that belongs to human nature. It was a complete human nature united to a Divine Person. Hence such formulations of Councils and Fathers as the following: "Total in His, total in ours" (St. Leo I); "perfect in Godhead, the same perfect in manhood" (Chalcedon); "total God-man and total Man-God" (St. Gelasius).

Having a human body meant having all that belongs to a human body, with all the affections thereof, most particularly, love, and a heart that beat in unison with all such affections. Hence—and these are the Holy Father's ipsissima verba—"the Heart of Jesus Christ, hypostatically united to the Divine Person of the Word, on account of love and of other impulses, doubtless had its physical beats. Such beatings, however, were so much in agreement and consonance with His human will full of divine charity, and with that infinite love which the Son has in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost, as to be entirely one harmony. In these three loves there was nothing contrary, nothing discordant."

Besides this consideration set in the light of the hypostatic union, there is also the consideration of Christ's humanity in relation to human redemption. The chief reason why the Son of God took a passible and mortal humanity was that He might suffer and die on a cross for the salvation of men. This truth is brought out by the Apostle, when he writes: "He who sanctifies, and those sanctified are all from one. Hence he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying: I will announce thy name to my brethren...And, again: Here am I and my children whom God gave to me. Because, therefore, the children shared in flesh and blood, he likewise shared in the same . . . Hence he had to be made like to his brethren in all things, in order to be a merciful and faithful Highpriest to God, propitiating the sins of the people. In that he himself suffered and was tried, he is able to help those who undergo trial" (Heb. 2 : 11-14; 17-18).

This double aspect of the human love of Christ, as Word Incarnate and Redeemer, is amply illustrated from the Fathers of the Eastern and Western Churches. St. Justin is quoted, St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome and St. Augustine. A compressed synthesis

is offered by St. John Damascene when he writes: "Whole Himself, He assumed me whole and entire; whole He is united to the whole, that he might bring salvation to the whole man. For that could not have been healed, which had not been assumed—Totum me totus assumpsit, ac totus toti unitus est, ut toti salutem afferret. Nam alioquin non potuit sanari, quod assumptum non fuit" (De Fide, Orth. 3 : 6).

Nowhere, however, in the Sacred Scriptures—not even in the Gospels—are those human movements and affections of Christ referred to His physical heart as to an indicator or symbol. The Gospels nevertheless describe those manifestations in such a way as to make us feel with the Saviour, when He shows desire, joy, sorrow, fear, anger. These appear in His face, in His words or in His gestures. Emotions, as St. Thomas Aquinas (taught by common experience) observes, show themselves in the external members, especially in those members in which traces of the heart are perceived, as in the eyes and the face and the tongue.

Hence the Heart of the Incarnate Word is rightly considered as a principal index and symbol of that triple love with which the Divine Redeemer loves the Father and all men continually. It is a symbol of that divine love which He has in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost. That love is in Him, however, as in the Word, and since the Word is made flesh, it manifests itself to us through a mortal and fragile body. "In Christ the whole fulness of the Godhead dwells corporeally."

The Heart is also a symbol of that infused charity enriching the human will of Christ and acting in function of His twofold knowledge, the knowledge of vision and the knowledge that is infused. The love of feeling or sense shows itself more naturally and directly, and the Heart is more obviously its symbol.

Since then, Scripture and traditional Catholic teaching assure us that supreme agreement and concord exist in the holy soul of Christ, and that He has directed His triple love to the end of our Redemption, we can rightly take His Heart as an image of His charity and of His redeeming charity: It may also be regarded as a mystic ladder by which we climb up to the embrace of God our Saviour. In this light we contemplate His words, His actions, His precepts, His miracles, and especially those manifestations which more clearly attest His love: namely, the institution of the Blessed Eucharist, His bitter Passion, the gift of His Mother, the founding of the Church, the sending of the Holy

Ghost to the Apostles and to ourselves. In all these we feel the pulsations of the Sacred Heart, the beatings which measured the space of His earthly pilgrimage till He bowed His head and gave up His spirit.

Then the beatings of His Heart ceased, till the day of His triumphant resurrection from the dead. In the state of eternal glory, His Sacred Heart pulsates with imperturbable and placid pulsations—It never ceases to beat and never will cease to beat, manifesting in its pulsations that triple love by which the Son of God is bound to His heavenly Father and to the whole community of men, whose mystical head He is.

III.

The pages of the Gospels are the richest sources which we can use for meditation on the human and divine manifestations of love in the mortal course of our Lord's life. From them comes the light by which we are helped and strengthened in our search for "the abundant riches of the grace [of God] in goodness towards us in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2 : 7).

When the Blessed Virgin spoke her generous "Fiat" at Nazareth, the Word Incarnate entered the world. And what did His adorable Heart say? St. Paul tells us from the mouth of the Psalmist: "Entering the world, he says: Sacrifice and oblation thou didst not wish, but a body thou didst fit for me; burnt offerings and sin-offerings did not please thee. Then I said: Behold, I have come—in the roll of the book it is written of me—to do thy will, o God... In this will we were sanctified by the offering of the body of Christ once for all" (Heb. 10 : 5-7, 10).

With the same love the Word Incarnate was moved, when with human affection utterly in harmony with divine love He had heavenly conversation in the home at Nazareth with His sweet Mother, and when he helped His putative father Joseph with obedient labour in the carpenter's craft. In that same triple love He was exercised during His public life in those long apostolic journeys, in his miracle-working, which included the raising of the dead and the curing of the sick, in his laborious days, in bearing fatigue and hunger and thirst, in those nocturnal vigils during which He prayed to His Father, in His discourses and parables, especially those dealing with mercy, such as the lost drachma, the lost sheep and the prodigal son. In all these the Heart of God manifested itself, and St. Gregory says: "Learn the Heart of

God in the words of God, that you may yearn more ardently for eternal things" (Ad Theodosium medicum).

Some words of the Saviour breathe charity in a special way. We feel this when we contemplate him looking at the crowds tired and hungry and woe-begone and hear Him saying: "I have compassion on the multitude" (Mk. 8 : 2); when He voices His affection for Jerusalem in the sad words: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killer of Prophets, stoner of those sent to thee, how often have I wished to gather thy children as a mother hen gathers her little ones under her wings, and thou wouldst not have it" (Mt. 23 : 37).

The love of His Father together with holy indignation beat in His Heart, when He saw the sacrilegious trading in the Temple and rebuked those who profaned it: "It is written: My house shall be called a house of prayer; but you have made it a den of thieves" (Mt. 21 : 13).

The love of the Passion holds a very special place. The emotions of natural repugnance but of entire acceptance of His Father's will were expressed in His words in Gethsemani, and there also His Heart made its last appeal to the traitor Judas, as this false disciple was about to perpetrate his infamous act of treachery: "Friend, for what hast thou come? Dost thou betray the Son of man with a kiss?" The compassion He expressed for the sympathetic women represented also the feelings of His Heart: "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep over me, but weep over yourselves and over your children...for, if these things are done in the green wood, what will happen in the dry?"

On the cross the Heart of Jesus vibrated to various intense feelings: most burning love, consternation, mercy, ardent desire, and serene peace. These feelings found expression in the "Father forgive" spoken on behalf of His executioners, in the word of dereliction: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?," in the pardon granted to the penitent thief, in the "Sitio" of thirst, and in the final word: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

Who could describe those beatings of the Divine Heart in those moments when He was giving His greatest gifts to men: Himself in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, His Holy Mother, the Priesthood?

In the Gospels we already feel the glow of the Eucharistic Heart, as the Supper begins, when Jesus said: "With the utmost desire I have desired to eat this Pasch with you, before I suffer." What must the vehemence of His Heart's love have been when He instituted the New Testament in the bread changed into His Body and in the chalice of His Blood?

In giving His Mother, the indivisible Associate of His redemption united with Him in calling back to the life of grace the children of Eve, He presented her in His dying hour as the spiritual Mother of all men. His feeling was commensurate with the gift. "Certainly," says St. Augustine, she is the Mother of the members of the Saviour, which we are, for she co-operated by charity, that faithful men and women should be born in the Church to be members of that head (De sancta virginilate 6).

In leaving us His sacrifice as our perpetual sacrifice, He fulfilled His own declaration: "Greater love than this no man has, that one should lay down his life for his friends." By this indeed we know the charity of God. He gave us Himself unto death, so that each can say: "He loved me and delivered himself for me."

It was in the love of His Sacred Heart that He joined the Church to Himself in mystic marriage. In the words of St. Thomas: "Through charity, for the joining of the Church to Himself as a spouse, He suffered." The liturgical hymn also says that it was from the pierced Heart that the Church came forth as Christ's Bride. This thought was familiar even to the early Fathers, who saw in the double stream of Blood and Water the sacraments that constitute the Church as a purified and redeemed spouse.

In heaven also the Divine Redeemer keeps the signs of His threefold victory over the demon, sin and death, and His Heart beats accordingly in dispensing the merits of His victory. From the right hand of the Father, He gives gifts to men; He fills everything (Eph. 4 : 8, 10).

The sending of the Holy Spirit was the first sign of His munificent charity after His triumphal ascent into heaven. This effusion of the Holy Spirit, Who is personal Love, is also from the Heart of the Saviour, "in whom all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden" (Col. 2 : 3). The whole life of the Church and all its victories are attributable to this most precious gift, so that in the contemplation of such outpouring of love we may well sing the Apostles' triumphal hymn: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation or distress or persecution or hunger or the sword?...But in all these things we are more than victorious through him who has loved us. I am sure that neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor might nor height nor depth nor any other creature can separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8 : 35, 37-39).

We can consider the Heart of the Saviour as the symbol of the divine Person of the Word and of that love, human and divine, which He has manifested and manifests. It is even the summing-up of the whole mystery of our Redemption. It was with this ineffable love of redemption that Christ loved the Church.

The same triple love of the Heart of Jesus continues in heaven, where He is our Advocate, "ever living to make intercession for us." The prayers of His inexhaustible love never cease. He shows His living Heart wounded and aflame with more efficacious love than when in death it received that wound from the Roman soldier's lance. "For this reason (Thy Heart) was wounded, that through the visible wound we might see the invisible wound of love" (St. Bonaventure).

Since devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus is substantially a mode of ascent from His wounded human nature to the Fountain of His redemptive goodness, namely His divine and human love, it always existed in some form in the Church, though it was only in later times that it was to take the form in which it has so wonderfully developed. The profession of the Apostle St. Thomas: "My Lord and my God" is an early Scriptural example of such an ascent from the wounds of the Saviour to the majesty of His Divine Person.

Although, indeed, the transfixed Heart of the Saviour was always an invitation to honour the infinite love which He bears to men, and although the words of the Prophet Zachary: "They shall gaze on him whom they have pierced" are referred by St. John to that transfixion, it is only little by little that the Heart came to be honoured as the symbol of human and divine love dwelling in the Word Incarnate.

Briefly, the stages of progress are indicated by the names of St. Albert and St. Bonaventure, of St. Gertrude, St. Catherine of Siena and Bl. Henry Suso, of St. Peter Canisius and St. Francis de Sales, of St. John Eudes, author of the liturgical worship of the Sacred Heart (Oct. 20, 1672), and especially St. Margart Mary Alacoque and her spiritual director, Bl. Claude de la Colombière.

Devotion to the Sacred Heart has not sprung from private revelations. It is a native development of the Christian religion as a religion of love. The revelations made to St. Margaret Mary added nothing to Christian doctrine. Their importance was in this, that Christ our Lord used extraordinary and singular means of bringing the minds of men to the contemplation and worship of the mystery of His merciful love. The Heart was held up as a symbol drawing men to the knowledge and

realisation of Christ's love; it was also a sign and a pledge of mercy and grace for the Church in the necessities of these later times.

That the cultus came from the principles of Christian doctrine is shown by the fact that the Apostolic See approved the liturgical solemnity, before it approved the writings of St. Margaret Mary. It was not on the strength of private revelations but in response to the desires of the faithful that the Sacred Congregation of Rites granted the liturgical feast to the Bishops of Poland and the Archconfratrenity of the Sacred Heart in Rome. The decree was approved by Clement XIII (Feb. 6, 1765). This approval was actually only the amplification of a cultus already existing, a cultus existing to maintain a symbolical renewal of the memory of Christ's redemptive love.

This approbation, by way of privilege, was followed, nearly a century later, by a decree of far greater moment, that of Pius IX (23 Aug., 1856), which extended the Feast of the Sacred Heart to the whole church. That is an act worthy of perpetual remembrance, for from it dates the triumph of devotion to the Sacred Heart throughout the whole world.

In the terms of Catholic theology and always with the mystery of the hypostatic union in view, the Encyclical repels the opinion of those who accuse devotion to the Sacred Heart of a certain materialistic sensualism. Such a view is close to a proposition already condemned by Pope Innocent XI. That proposition wrongly asserted that interior souls should not elicit acts of love towards the humanity of Christ. But devotion to the Sacred Heart, as already explained, honours not merely the sense-love of Christ, but the triple love of the Word Incarnate. Hence it is a devotion supremely conducive to the practice of charity, which is the Saviour's "new commandment."

V.

The final section of the Encyclical is an exhortation—an exhortation to a full, universal practice of this devotion of love—an exhortation coming from him whom our Lord left to us on earth as the Vicar of His love. (St. Ambrose).

The cultus of the Sacred Heart is not something optional; it is a form of piety providentially conducive to perfection. Devotion, indeed, is nothing but the will to give oneself with all promptness to the service of God. And what service can be nobler or sweeter than the service of Love itself? Nothing can be more pleasing to God than the gifts we offer Him out of love. Love is the first gift of all on which all freely

given gifts depend. The commendation of this devotion by Christ our Lord Himself, the high praises with which Pontiffs have adorned it, in memorable documents, really amount to this, that christian life is more spontaneous and easy, if lived in the atmosphere of the love of the Sacred Heart. To belittle devotion to the Sacred Heart is both rash and hurtful.

Besides, the provocation of love which comes from the Sacred Heart strains selfishness out of our devotion. It is not for His benefits that God is served but only for His love.

In the past this devotion has produced innumerable spiritual fruits. These must continue and be increased, especially in this age in which the hatred of God is so aggressively rampant.

Certainly the evils that surround us are great, but the remedy is not wanting. No form of piety can be more noble, more sweet, more salubrious than a cultus which is totally directed to the love of God. There is nothing that can help so much towards moving the faithful to make the evangelical law an actuality in their lives—nothing more efficacious for this end than the charity of Christ in His Sacred Heart. As Leo XIII said: "Here is set before the eyes of the faithful a most auspicious and divine sign: the Sacred Heart of Jesus, shining with splendour and aflame with fire. In This all hope is to be placed; from This the salvation of men is to be sought and expected" (Annum Sacrum).

There is no better banner of unity, salvation and peace than the Sacred Heart. As approved and encouraged by the Church it does not hinder other legitimate forms of piety. On the contrary, it is the life of various devotions. An intimate devotion to the Passion and the Blessed Sacrament derives interior strength from the contemplation of the Redeemer's Heart. The revelations made to St. Gertrude and to St. Margaret Mary show that something will be wanting to one's devotion to Jesus Crucified, unless the mystic sanctuary of His Heart lies open before one. Similarly, there is no better way of understanding the outpouring of love in which Christ gave us the Blessed Eucharist as our spiritual nourishment.

For the establishment of the kingdom of God in the world and the efficacious checking of the haters of God the discipline of divine charity which this devotion embodies is of the utmost value. Again, quoting Pope Leo XIII, "The kingdom of Jesus Christ takes its force and form from divine charity. To love in the holiness of charity and in the order

of charity is the foundation and sum-total of that kingdom. From such love flows inviolate attention to duty, respect of the rights of others, the setting of human things in their right place, below the things of heaven, preference of the love of God above everything" (Enc. *Tametsi,* 1900).

"In order that greater profit may accrue from devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the devotion must be closely associated with that of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. By the will of God the Blessed Virgin was inseparably joined to Christ in the work of human Redemption, in such wise that from the love of Jesus Christ and His sufferings together with the love and sorrows of His Mother our salvation came." It is, therefore, becoming, on the part of the Christian people, as having received divine life from Christ through Mary, to set the second devotion with the first. After showing due honour to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the piety of the faithful should also flow to the loving Heart of Their heavenly Mother, piety made of love, gratitude and expiation. With this wise counsel of Divine Providence corresponds the memorable consecration of the Church and the whole world solemnly made in 1942 to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

This year is the centenary year of the extension of the Feast of the Sacred Heart to the universal church. The Holy Father desires that the Christian people should worthily celebrate the occasion with public adoration, thanksgiving and works of reparation offered to the Divine Heart. These solemnities of Christian joy and Christian piety will doubtless be celebrated with most special religious ardour in the Nation from which came the holy nun who was the apostle of this devotion. But all nations should unite in the bonds of charity and prayer to celebrate the memory of so great an event.

W. LEONARD.

The Basic Virtue

When God reveals something that our intellect cannot see for itself, He requires us to bow our heads in creaturely submission and affirm that it is so. Faith is a form of worship, a homage demanded of man's highest powers: *"plenum revelanti Deo intellectus et voluntatis obsequium."*

The Catholic teaching on faith was luminously expounded in the Vatican Council's *"Constitutio de Fide Catholica,"* a document to which our great reigning Pontiff several times referred in the Encyclical *"Humani generis,"* condemning the aberrations of some of our contemporaries who either had not studied the Church's teaching or else failed to heed it.

Although formally an act of the intellect, faith is not merely an intellectual process. It has an affective side, for it supposes some moral dispositions before revealed truth is accepted, and the acceptance itself involves an assent to the whole Christian moral code. An act of faith is not the conclusion of any chain of reasoning. Reason could never lead us to affirm, for example, that God is three in persons, for we simply cannot see the compatibility of threeness in personhood with oneness in nature. The will commands the intellect to form that judgment, moved, of course, by grace.

Its immediate relation to God gives to faith, as to hope and charity, a divine character, usually described with the not very satisfactory term "theological." The divineness of faith consists in this, that what we know by faith is nothing less than God in His distinctive inner life; and also in this, that our reason for believing is not our own ability but God's perfection, in particular, His knowledge and veracity. Those virtues which regulate conduct are human, even when infused, but faith goes direct to God and also pays homage to His perfection.

Faith is a surrender, our first surrender to the Author and Perfecter of our supernatural life. St. Paul asserted that a man is justified by faith, because, as the Council of Trent explained, faith is the starting-point of our salvation, and the foundation and root of our being made just. No one can be saved without justification, and no one is made just without faith. What revealed truths are the minimum to which anyone must assent, we leave to St. Thomas to say, under the heading, "The Faith Necessary for Salvation."

Clearly, real humility must be one of the moral dispositions for affirming what we cannot see for ourselves. The self-sufficient man is not teachable. Our Blessed Lord pointed out that to come to Him it would be necessary to learn (Jo. vi, 45), and when He said that unless we became as little children we should not enter the kingdom of God, which on earth is His Church, it is easy to see why: because without humility there is no docility, and hence no faith is possible.

The assent of faith is not possible without also a grace which is an unmerited gift of God, as Christ said more than once: for example, "No man can come to Me unless the Father draw him" (Jo. vi, 44).

We should be cautious about the use of the term "faith," by non-Catholics amongst whom we live, for it may mean various things ranging from a vague trust, having no definite object, up to an assent which superficially resembles what we mean by faith. Supposing the user means assent—and he usually does not—he probably does not mean any more than a cherished opinion, or at most a personal conviction which allows room for other views. It is not just a matter of how many dogmas of the Catholic Creed he holds, but mainly a matter of how he holds them. The difference is not only quantitative but also qualitative—a fact generally overlooked by conciliationists or "irenists."

The following passages have been selected and translated from the *Secunda Secundae* of St. Thomas to illustrate pastoral teaching.

We Must be Pupils in the School of God.

"The final beatitude of man consists in a supernatural seeing of God. Man cannot reach this vision unless he be a learner, with God as his teacher: 'Everyone that has listened to the Father and learned comes to me'. Now a man receives this teaching not all at once but successively, as his nature requires. Before he can attain the perfection of knowledge a learner must believe, as even the Philosopher says; and therefore if one is to reach that perfection which is the beautific vision, the first requisite is to believe God, as a pupil believes his master." (II, 3).

"He who believes has ample motive for doing so, since he is led by the authority of God's teaching, confirmed by miracles and, what is greater, by the interior prompting of God calling him." (II, 9).

The Certainty of Faith.

"Just as a person of little knowledge is more certain about something which he hears from a man of knowledge than about what appears to himself from reason, so a man is more certain, with much greater

cause, of what he learns from God, who cannot be mistaken, than of what he sees by his own reasoning, which can be mistaken." (IV, 8 ad 2).

"Certainty may be considered in two ways: (1) in regard to the cause of certainty, and thus a thing is said to be more certain if its cause is more certain. In this way faith is more certain (than wisdom, science, or understanding) because it rests on divine truth, while those three rest on human reason. (2) Certainty may be considered on the part of the person who has it, and in this way a thing is called more certain if the human intellect grasps it more fully. Since in this way matters of faith exceed the human intellect whereas the other three do not, it follows that faith on this side is less certain." (IV, 8).

"As far as faith goes, the intellect is always led to truth, since falsity cannot underlie faith. However, the soul owes its right ordering to charity, which perfects faith. Perfected faith, therefore, is a virtue, but unperfected faith is not a virtue, because, although an act of unperfected faith has its due perfection as far as the intellect is concerned, it has not its due perfection as far as the will is concerned." (IV, 5).

Faith and Reason.

"A person may know by proof that God is One and yet believe by faith that He is Three. But knowledge by proof is not compatible with opinion or with faith, about the same object under the same aspect at the same time . . . What is known by proof is seen; what is believed is not seen." (I, 5 ad 4).

"The reasons offered by the saints to support truths of faith are not demonstrations but suasive arguments, to show that what the faith teaches is not impossible; or else they proceed from premises that are of faith, from Scriptural authorities, and in this case the proof is conclusive for believers, just as one from rational principles is conclusive for everybody. On this account, incidentally, theology is a science." (I, 5).

"Whatever opposes faith, whether in one's study of it or by way of external persecution, increases the merit of faith in proportion to the promptness and constancy of the will in believing. Thus the martyrs had more merit from their faith because they did not relinquish it on account of persecutions, and thus too the learned merit more by their faith because they do not falter through the arguments of philosophers and heretics." (II, 10 ad 3).

Articles of Faith.

"The objects of Christian belief are distinguished into what are called *articuli* (joints), inasmuch as they are divided into certain parts which fit together. Now, an object of faith is something unseen concerning divine things . . . and hence where something is unseen for a special reason, there a special article is found. But if several things are known, or unknown, for one cause, no distinction of articles is called for. Thus there is a difficulty in seeing that God suffered and another in seeing that He rose from death to life, and so the article on the Resurrection is distinct from that on the Passion. But one and the same difficulty is presented by the facts that He suffered and died and was buried, so that if we accept one it is not difficult to accept the others; and this is why all these are comprised in one article." (I, 6).

"Just as all principles are reduced to this as the first, *it is impossible to affirm and to deny at the same time,* as the Philosopher makes clear in *Metaphysics,* IV, so all articles are contained in certain first credibles, namely, belief in God's existence and in His providence for human salvation: 'He that cometh to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that seek Him'. (Heb., xi, 6). In God's existence are included all the realities which we believe exist eternally in God and in which our eternal blessedness lies. In His providence are included all His temporal dispensations for man's salvation, which are the way to blessedness." (I, 7).

"The Nicene Creed clarifies the Apostles Creed, and therefore it was drawn up when the faith was manifest and the Church had peace; and that is why it is sung publicly in the Mass. But the Apostles' Creed was formed in time of persecution, when the faith was not yet openly proclaimed, and so it is said secretly, in Prime and Compline, as though contending with the darkness of past and future errors." (I, 9, ad 6).

The Faith Necessary for Salvation.

"Those things pertain to faith on their own account whose vision will delight us in eternal life and which will lead us thereto. The objects to be seen are two: the secret of the Godhead, whose vision beatifies us, and the mystery of Christ's humanity, through which we have access to the glory of the sons of God (Rom., v. 2); and hence John (xvii, 3) says, 'This is eternal life: that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent'." (I, 3).

"The means through which man obtains heaven should be believed expressly and on its own account. But the road through which men

reach heaven is the mystery of Christ's Incarnation and Passion: 'For there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved' (Acts iv, 12). Hence the mystery of the Incarnation of Christ had to be believed somehow in every age and among all people, with differences however according to the age and the persons . . . After the time when grace was revealed, not only the chief persons but also the lesser ones are bound to have explicit faith about the mysteries of Christ." (II, 7).

"The mystery of the Incarnation cannot be believed explicitly without belief in the Trinity, because the mystery of the Incarnation includes this, that it was the Son of God who assumed flesh and that He was conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost . . . And so, again, since the time when grace was made generally known, all are bound to believe explicitly the mystery of the Trinity: 'Going, therefore, teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' (Matt., xxviii, 19)." (II, 8).

"Faith" that is Not Faith.

" 'The devils also believe and tremble' (Ja., ii, 9). A believer's intellect assents to what he believes, not because he sees it either in itself or implied in self-evident principles, but because he is convinced by divine authority to assent to what he does not see and because the will, which moves the intellect in obedience to God, so commands. The will may move the intellect to assent for one of two reasons: (1) because the will is disposed to good, and such belief is praiseworthy; or (2) because the intellect is convinced to the extent of judging that credence must be given to the assertions, although the things asserted remain themselves inevident. In Christ's faithful, is found the first kind of faith, the laudable . . . In devils faith is not of this but of the second kind; for they see many manifest signs from which they gather that the Church's teaching is from God, although they do not see for themselves the things taught by the Church: for example, that God is both Three and One, or suchlike." (V, 2).

"In a heretic who disbelieves one article of faith there is left no faith, perfected or unperfected. The reason is that the nature of any habit depends on its formal object, and when this ceases the same habit no longer remains. Now the formal object of faith is the First Truth insofar as it is manifest in Sacred Scripture and in the Church's teaching, which proceeds from the First Truth. Hence if a man does not adhere to the infallible divine rule which is the Church's teaching and

which proceeds from the First Truth, made manifest in Sacred Scripture, he has not the habit of faith but holds things of faith in some other way which is not faith . . . Hence he who is a heretic in regard to one article has not faith in regard to the other articles but a sort of opinion, following his own will." (V, 3).

Fear and Purity of Heart: Fruits of Faith

"Faith causes us to recognise that certain evils are inflicted by the divine judgment as punishments. In this way faith is the cause of a fear of being punished by God, and this is servile fear. It also causes filial fear, whereby a person fears to be separated from God, out of reverence for Him; for faith gives us this estimate of God, that He is the infinite, high Being, to be separated from whom is the greatest misfortune and to attempt to compare oneself with whom is evil. The first kind of fear, servile, is caused by unperfected faith; the second, filial, is caused by perfected faith, which, through the medium of charity, makes a man cleave to God and be subject to Him." (VII, 1).

"Impurity in anything consists in its being mixed with viler things. Silver is said to be impure not if mixed with gold, which would make it better, but if mixed with lead or tin. Now, the rational creature is clearly nobler than every kind of temporal and corporal creature, and hence it is made impure by subjecting itself to temporal things by love. Cleansing from this impureness is had by a contrary motion, i.e., by striving towards what is above self, God. In this movement the starting-point is faith, for 'he that comes to God must believe' (Heb., vi. 6). Hence the beginning of purification is faith, which purges error and which when perfected by charity leads to complete purification." (VII, 2).

The Gift of Understanding.

"Faith simply means assent to what is proposed, but understanding means a comprehension of the truth in relation to the last end, such as is possible only for a person in the state of grace." (VIII, 5 ad 3).

"Some people in the state of grace may lack understanding in regard to certain things not necessary for salvation, but in regard to the things necessary for salvation we are sufficiently instructed by the Holy Ghost: 'His unction teacheth you all things' (1 Jo. ii. 27)." (VIII, 4 ad 1).

"There is a twofold vision of God: one perfect, in which God is seen in His essence; the other imperfect, in which, while not seeing what God is, we see what He is not—and our knowledge of God in this life

is all the more finished in proportion as we understand that He exceeds whatever our intellect grasps. Both kinds of vision pertain to the gift of understanding: the first, to the complete gift of understanding, which will be in heaven; the second, to the initial gift such as is had in this life." (VII, 7).

Want of Faith.

"Infidelity, as a sin, results from pride. Through pride a man does not want to subject his intellect to the rules of faith and the sound interpretation given by the Fathers. Hence Gregory says in his *Moralia* that the presumptions of innovation are due to vain glory." (X, 1 ad 3).

"Any other sin, such as adultery, if committed by a believer and and infidel, is punished more grievously, *caeteris paribus,* in the believer, because he sins more grievously than the infidel. This is because of the knowledge of truth which he has from the faith, and also because of the sacraments of the faith in which he has been initiated and which he insults by sinning." (X, 3 ad 3).

Public Debates: Toleration.

"There is no danger in debating the faith in the presence of learned persons who are strong in the faith. But as regards simple persons, a distinction must be made. Either (1) they are being molested or attacked by unbelievers, such as Jews or heretics, or by pagans, all trying to destroy the believers' faith; or (2) they are under no such influence, as is true in countries where unbelievers do not exist. In the former case, it is necessary to hold public discussions on the faith, provided that persons can be found who are equal to the task and capable of refuting the errors. In this way the simple will be fortified in faith and the unbelievers will be deprived of the opportunity of deceiving. Silence from those who should resist subverters of the truth of faith would be a confirmation of error . . . In the second case, it is dangerous to argue publicly about the faith in the presence of the simple. Their faith is stronger for the fact that they have heard nothing different from what they believe, and so it is not expedient for them to hear what unbelievers say in arguing against the faith." (X, 7).

"Human government derives from God's government and should imitate it. God, although almighty and supremely good, allows in the universe evils which He could prevent, lest by stopping them greater evils should follow. . . . Therefore, although unbelievers sin in their observances, these may be tolerated because of some good that results or because of some evil that is avoided." (X, 11).

CORNELIUS ROBERTS.

"Except it be for Fornication"

A SUGGESTED INTERPRETATION

Non-Catholic Christians make two objections to the Catholic teaching on the indissolubility of marriage. The objections are not consistent but each has its individual force. Against the Catholic total prohibition of divorce the clauses in St. Matthew (5, 32; 19, 9) are urged as allowing it. When it is argued that the overall teaching of the New Testament is that marriage by its institution is indissoluble, it is asked how then can the Church be justified in dissolving *matrimonia legitima* in favour of the Faith. The teaching of the Church is clear. In "Casti Connubii", Pius XI wrote: "And if this stability seems to be open to exception however rare the exception may be, as in the case of certain natural marriages between unbelievers, or amongst Christians, in the case of those marriages which though valid have not been consummated, that exception does not depend on the will of men nor on that of any merely human power but on divine law, of which the only guardian and interpreter is the Church of Christ. However, not even this power can ever affect for any cause whatever a Christian marriage which is valid and has been consummated, for, as it is plain that here the marriage contract has its full completion, so, by the Will of God, there is also the greatest firmness and indissolubility which may not be destroyed by any human authority."

That Catholic writers feel there is need to explain the practice, though very rare, of dissolving *matrimonia legitima* is evident from such remarks as that of Fr. Bonsirven, S.J., in his concluding words of "Le Divorce dans le Nouveau Testament." "Reste la question très épineuse en droit, du privilège paulin; sur ce point, tout comme lorsqu' elle accorde la dispense de rompre un mariage valide mais non encore consommé, l'église s'appuie sur les directives de St. Paul, acceptant le divorce d'un conjoint infidèle; pratique attribuant a l'épouse du Christ une sorte de pouvoir divin sur les serments comme sur les voeux."

The purpose of this article is to argue in support of the suggestion that the very clauses in St. Matthew, used as justification for divorce among Christians, supply the Scriptural evidence for the Catholic position. The interpretation of these clauses has been the subject of controversy since the days of St. Augustine, who called it a *latebrosissima questio*. Readers are referred to Fr. Bonsirven's book

for a discussion of the history of the interpretations. Moreover, I take it as beyond argument that the teaching of Christ is clear from the New Testament, and that He taught that marriage is by its institution indissoluble and He was restoring it to its original state. The problem is to explain the Pauline privilege.

The difficulty in interpreting the restrictive clauses in St. Matthew is due to obscurities in the grammar and in the meaning of a key-word. I pass over the grammatical difficulty. If we fix the meaning of the key-word, the grammar is not very important. The word is *porneia*, the ordinary Greek word for fornication. But if we translate it fornication, the passage doesn't make sense. If it is taken as meaning adultery and used as justification for divorce, then (a) why does Our Lord use fornication in the restrictive clauses and adultery in the rest of the context? and (b) He would be contradicting His own position which was to reject the common ground in the Pharisees' dispute, that divorce was allowable for some reason. The more common interpretation since St. Jerome's time, that He was providing for separation and not divorce, is open to the first objection just mentioned—why speak of fornication and not of adultery?—and it seems very clumsy and disproportionate to introduce a minor point into the major discussion. Fr. Bonsirven (and others) suggests that *porneia* should be understood as a 'faux mariage', a marrigae contracted contrary to Jewish law. He produces evidence, which I find convincing that *porneia* did mean in Jewish circles such a union. But while explaining the choice of word, the interpretation does not explain why the reference is introduced at all. Impediments, even diriment ones, to marriage are a minor consideration when the basic meaning of marriage in the life and destiny of man is under discussion.

I suggest that *porneia* in the clauses means something equivalent to lack of faith, the absence of what the Council of Trent defines as "the origin, foundation and root of all justification." I suggest that this interpretation makes the texts intelligible, harmonises them with the other references in the New Testament and gives Scriptural authority for the dissolution of legitima matrimonia in favorem fidei.

To argue every point in any detail would make this article too long for the *Record*. I would only ask the readers to try the interpretation out in the various questions that arise in the study of the Catholic teaching on marriage. Here I propose to discuss a number of texts from the New Testament in which the word *porneia* and its cognates are

used, and to argue that, if that meaning is given them, the texts yield better sense.

Our Lord taught His gospel in a Jewish social climate. "Salvation is from the Jews." We, who are of gentile stock and tradition, must keep that in mind in learning the Gospel. With the Jews, sin was a forsaking of God. The terrible picture of Romans 1, 19-32 is the expression of the common attitude. Sexual immorality and worship of false gods were bracketed together. (This association between impurity and loss of faith is traditional in the Church to this day, and every priest of experience knows how justified it is.) How far the Jews were correct in this view of their position as the chosen race may be questioned. But there is no doubt that, to be legitimate children of Abraham was to be true children of God, was fundamental in Jewish thought. Moreover Christ's message was the gospel of regeneration and of supernatural life. Christ (and His disciples) taught no philosophy or a merely natural religion. The metaphor used again and again to convey this teaching was the language of human generation. One has to be born again, and to become a son of God. (Cf John 1, 12; 3, 3; 2 Cor. 5, 17; Ephes. 2, 5; Tit. 3,5; Jam 1, 18; 1 Pet. 1, 3; etc.) What more likely than that a word used to denote sexual wrongdoing should be employed to denote supernatural failure?—just as we speak of "mortal" sin.

In discussing the texts in which this meaning of *porneia* is noted, I omit almost entirely any reference to the Old Testament, as superfluous. Fr. Prat, S.J., can write simply: "Among whom (the Jews) fornication and idolatry were called by the same name, *porneia*" (*St. Paul,* vol. 1, p. 102). Jerem. 3:9 is typical: "And by the facility of her fornication she defiled the land and played the harlot with stones and stocks." (Cf. Lev. 20, 5; Judges 8, 27; Isais 1, 21 and 57, 2-5; Jerem. 2, 20; Ezech. 16, 17; 20, 30-31; Osee 4, 13, ps. 105, 39).

The first New Testament texts I bring in proof of the suggested interpretation are Matt. 12, 39 and 16, 4, and Mark 8, 37. Matthew in two places and Mark in one, tell that Our Lord called the Jews a "wicked and adulterous generation" for not believing in Him. (The word used is a cognate of adultery, and not of fornication, but the metaphor is the same.) What meaning can "adulterous" have except "unbelieving"? It is significant that St. Luke (11, 29) omits "adulterous", when telling what St. Matthew has just told. Matthew's readers (and it is in Matthew's readers, the Jews, that we are interested) would

understand the use of the word; Luke's readers, the Gentiles, would not, so easily.

2. The next text is from St. Jude. I give my own translation of verses 5-8. "I wish to remind you—you once knew it all—that the Lord, though He rescued the people from the land of Egypt, yet later on destroyed those who disbelieved, and that those angels who did not keep their due order, but left the dwelling place assigned to them, he has kept in darkness, in eternal chains, to await the judgment of the great day; (I wish to remind you) how Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, having in like manner to these *given themselves completely to fornication* and gone after alien flesh, how they now lie an example to all, having undergone the judgment of eternal fire. So, in like manner, these too, giving themselves to dreams, defile the flesh, disregard authority and insult august names."

St. Jude is warning his readers of the dangers of listening to false teachers and abandoning the true doctrine. He reminds them of events in the past and compares them to the present situation, and predicts like punishment. Like the Israelites in the desert who lost faith, like the angels who rebelled and left their proper place, like Sodom and Gomorrah which fornicated and went after alien flesh, so these teachers defile the flesh, disregard authority and insult august names. The warning throughout is against those who forsake the truth. What is the meaning of *ekporneusai* in verse 7, which translated literally means "fornicated utterly"? To keep the balance, it would refer to the same lack of loyalty to God as exhibited by the angels who rebelled and the Israelites who disbelieved. That this is the meaning is borne out by the difficulties the translators have found in rendering *ton homoion tropon toutois.* The literal meaning is: "in like manner to these." The Douay and the Authorised versions read, "in like manner" but they take no account of *toutois,* "to these." Who are "these"? The natural reference would be to the angels, and it is made by many commentators. On these Van Steenkiste remarks: "multi auctores intelligunt *toutois*: simili modo ac angeli lapsi, quos pari modo peccato impudicitiae deliquisse autumant. Verum *toutois* ad Sodoman et Gomorrham, vel, 'per synesim', ad istarum civitatum incolas referri potest, ita ut dictus error circa naturam peccati angelorum apud s. Judam asseri non necessario debeat."

If however we remember that fornication and idolatry were almost interchangable terms in the Old Testament the difficulty disappears.

The Sodomites fell away from God and gave themselves over to unnatural lust and met with a punishment that became a byword; the angels rebelled and left their place and they too were punished. There is no difficuly in using the same word, fornication, in its metaphorical sense, of both infidelities.

This view is further strengthened if we recall other references in the Old and New Testaments to Sodom and Gommorah. In St. Jude the destroyed cities "lie an example"—an example of punishment, for what? Doesn't Deut. 29, 22-26, give the answer? Moses is speaking. "And the strangers that shall come from afar, seeing the plagues of that land and the evils wherewith the Lord hath afflicted it, burning it with brimstone, and the heat of salt, so that it cannot be sown any more, nor any green thing grow therein, *after the example of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Adama and Seboim,* which the Lord destroyed in his wrath and indignation: And all the nations shall say: Why hath the Lord done thus to this land? What meaneth this exceeding great heat of his wrath? And they shall answer: Because they forsook the covenant of the Lord, which He made with their fathers, when He brought them out of the land of Egypt. And *they have served strange gods, and adored them,* whom they knew not, and for whom they had not been assigned." The great sin of Sodom was surely alienation from God.

We may also compare Luke 10, 10-11, "but into whatsoever city you enter and they receive you not, going forth into the streets thereof, say, Even the very dust of your city that cleaveth to us, we wipe off against you. Yet know this, that the kingdom of God is at hand. I say to you, it shall be more tolerable at that day for Sodom than for that city." The sin of Bethsaida and Corazain was the rejection of Christ, in spite of the miracles. Their sin is greater than that of Sodom, because of their greater light. The point of comparison is again the absence of faith.

A reading of Chapter 16 of Ezechiel can scarcely leave any doubt that the great sin of Sodom was that of Jerusalem, viz., apostasy from God, which is described throughout as fornication. Compare verse 50 of Ezechiel, "So it was they (Sodom and Gomorrah) rebelled against me, ever must I see foul deeds done, till I rid myself of them, as thou seest", with verse 7 of St. Jude, "having in like manner to these given themselves completely to fornication, and gone after alien flesh how thy now lie an example to all."

3. In Hebrews 12, 14-17 (Douay) we read, "Follow peace with all men and holiness: without which no man shall see God. Looking diligently lest any man be wanting to the grace of God, lest any root of bitterness springing up to hinder, and by it many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator or profane person as Esau, who for one mess sold his birthright. For know ye that afterwards when he desired to inherit the benediction, he was rejected. For he found no place of repentance, although with tears he had sought it."

What is the meaning of "fornicator" here? First of all, does it refer to Esau? The natural reading of the text would favour "yes," and so the Douay and the Authorised versions seem to take it. The text gives three clauses introduced by the negative particle *mē*, and would read in English: "(take care) *lest* any fail God's grace, *lest* a root of bitterness springing up, etc., *lest* there be any fornicator or profane person like Esau." But there is no record in the Old Testament of fornication in the literal sense by Esau. And if we take it as not referring to Esau, what place has the literal meaning in the argument?

The author, throughout most of the Epistle, is arguing the necessity of faith in Christ. In this chapter he encourages his readers to accept the sufferings for the faith as the chastisement of a God who, like a father chastises his true children. It is bastards who are not chastised. (The same metaphor again!) Taken in the literal sense, fornication is scarcely in place in the argument, but taken in a metaphorical sense, it fits the drift of the argument and explains the allusion to Esau.

The view that it is the metaphorical sense that is meant becomes more convincing when we recall two passages from the Old Testament. What is the point in "root of bitterness"? The answer is in Deut, 29, 18. "Lest perhaps there should be among you a man or a woman, a family or a tribe, *whose heart is turned away this day from the Lord our God,* to go and serve the gods of those nations; and there should be among you a root bringing forth gall and bitterness." And what was Esau's offence? Is it not to be found in Gen. 26, 34. "Esau, who was by this time forty years old, married two wives, Judith, *the daughter of Beeri the Hethite,* and Basemath, *the daughter of another Hethite,* Elon. Both of these distressed the hearts of Isaac and Rebecca." I take it then that Esau was called a fornicator because he married women who would lead him from God, and he was profane because his "god was his belly."

The meaning of the whole passage then is clear. The author

repeats the warning by reminding them of Jewish history with its story of rejection of grace and the consequences. *Pornos* is not to be taken in its literal but in a metaphorical sense.

4. 1 Cor. 5, 9-11. "I wrote to you in an epistle not to keep company with fornicators. I mean not with the fornicators of this world or with the covetous or the extortioners or the servers of idols; otherwise you needs must go out of this world. But now I have written to you not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator or covetous or a server of idols or a railer or a drunkard or an extortioner, with such a one, not so much as to eat." (Douay).

Again what is the meaning of fornicator here? St. Paul has told the Corinthians to excommunicate their incestuous brother Corinthian. He recalls that he had told them in a letter not to keep company with fornicators, but now he explains that he referred only to Christians, not to pagans. In the former letter, it would seem that St. Paul spoke of fornicators only. Now, without any explanation, he brackets the misers, the extortioners and the idolators with the fornicators.

The Douay, the Authorised and the Knox versions have an "or" and not an "and" in verse 10. There is little MS authority for the "or," The better reading gives, "the covetous *and* the extortioners, or the servers of idols." In other places (see later on), St. Paul explains that avarice or extortion is idolatry. Verse 10 then would carry the suggestion that avarice and greed, like fornication, is a form of idolatry. There is no doubt that St. Paul's thought at the moment is directed to sexual sins—he is dealing with a *porneia* of a particular Corinthian; but I suggest that the Jewish habit of looking upon idolatry as spiritual fornication enables St. Paul to use the word in both senses in the same passage without adverting to a transition.

5. In the decree of the Council of Jerusalem, the Apostles bid the gentile converts "to abstain from what is contaminated by idolatry, from fornication, and from meat which has been strangled or has the blood in it." What is "fornication" in the literal sense doing here? Fr. Bonsirven points out that in the context it is the "odd man out." He seeks for its meaning in the purpose of the council which was to decide how much of Jewish observance was to be imposed on the gentiles. He suggests that it means a "faux mariage." It may be so, but he adduces little evidence from the New Testament in support of his position. I suggest that the solution is to be found in the licentiousness of pagan temple worship. The feasting and the impurities associated

with idolatry were abominable to the Jews and all three are bracketed together as porneia. (Cf., the examples given later on from the Apocalypse).

6. Fr. Bonsirven quotes 1 Cor. 5, 1, as an example of the use of *porneia* as a "faux mariage." "It is absolutely heard that there is fornication among you and such fornication as the like is not among the heathens; that one should have his father's wife." *Porneia* could have here the meaning of "faux mariage," but it would seem from 2 Cor. 7, 12, that St. Paul was rather referring to the union of a man with his step-mother during the lifetime of his father, that it was not a marriage in any sense but an incestuous alliance. Obviously, it could not have here the meaning I have been suggesting, of infidelity to God, except in a general sense.

7. John 8, 31 sqq. In this chapter there is a rather long discussion with the Jews on truth and freedom. Our Lord tells them that if they believed in Him they would know the truth and the truth would make them free. They appeal to their descent from Abraham. He says they are disloyal to Abraham, for not acting as Abraham did and having faith. "But now you seek to kill me, a man who have spoken the truth to you, which I have heard of God. This Abraham did not. You do the works of your father (the devil). They said therefore to him: We are not born of fornication: we have one Father, even God."

What place has the literal meaning here The word can only mean a compound of two notions, legitimate descent from Abraham and loyalty to God. No explanation of the choice of word was thought necessary by St. Matthew.

8. The following texts from two of the minor Pauline epistles illustrate the association in St. Paul's mind between impurity and other moral faults, and idolatry.

Ephesians 5, 5, "For know you this and understand: That no fornicator or unclean or covetous person, *which is a serving of idols,* hath inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God."

Col. 3, 5, "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, lust, evil concupiscence and covetousness, *which is the service of idols,* etc.

9. In 1 Cor. 10, 8, we read, "Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed fornication; and there fell in one day three and twenty thousand." The reference is to Num. 25, 1 sqq. "Meanwhile, the Israelites were dwelling at Settim; and here they fell

a-whoring with the women of Moab. These bade them come and *partake of their own sacrifices,* and *worship their own gods,* so that the sons of Israel learned the rites of Beelphegor. And the Lord was indignant." Again the same association of idolatry, feasting and impurity!

In the Apocalypse there are many references to the close association in St. John's mind between unbelief and sin, between idolatry and fornication. It is difficult to be sure in each case which thought is uppermost.

Apoc. 2, 14, "But I have against thee a few things, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam who taught Balac to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, *to eat and commit fornication.*"

Apoc. 2, 20, "But I have against thee a few things; because thou sufferest the woman Jezabel, who calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants, to *commit fornication and to eat of things sacrificed to idols.*"

Apoc. 14, 8, "And another angel followed, saying: That great Babylon is fallen, is fallen; which made all nations to drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication."

Apoc. 17, 1-2, "And there came one of seven angels who had the seven vials and spoke with me, saying: Come, I will shew thee the condemnation of the great harlot, who sitteth upon many waters; With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication. And they who inhabit the earth have been drunk with the wine of her whoredom." And similarly, in verses 4, 5, 15, 16 and in 18, 3.

Apoc. 19, 2, "Salvation and glory and power is to our God. For true and just are his judgments, who hath judged the great harlot which corrupt the earth with her fornication and hath revenged the blood of his servants, at her hands."

There are other aspects of Christian teaching on marriage which, in an article of limited length, have to be omitted, but I suggest that the interpretation I have proposed will be found to confirm the traditional teachings. Such aspects are the distinction between diriment and impedient impediments, legitimate and Christian marriage, marriage before and after the Fall; marriage as a source of grace, marriage and consecrated virginity. On all these questions I lack the training of the expert, but I know, from experience, how difficult it is to present Christian teaching on marriage to the pagan world of to-day. I suggest to the exegetes and the theologians to give thought to this interpretation

of *porneia* as possibly throwing light on vexed questions. I should mention that it is not that opinion once held, but later retracted, by St. Augustine that it meant any grievous sin, which is idolatry, and that such grievous sin would be grounds for separation a mensa et thoro. I say it means what the Church has in mind when it dissolves valid matrimonial contracts in favorem fidei.

To sum up. There is no accepted interpretation of *porneia* in the texts, going back to the Fathers. It has always been a puzzle. Western theologians who held to absolute prohibition of divorce were embarrassed by it. Eastern theologians were embarrassed by the over-all teaching of the New Testament against divorce, but they held to these clauses as grounds for full divorce. And a first reading of the clauses does convey the impression that they are in some way exceptive rather than restrictive. I suggest the word has the meaning familiar to the Jews in Old and New Testament times, i.e., of wilful rejection of God and His Christ. Some of the passages where the word is used in the New Testament make sense only when given the metaphorical interpretation. In other passages it has a meaning that is confined to the literal sense; while in others again, the literal and metaphorical senses telescope into each other. This interpretation is in harmony with the over-all teaching of the New Testament and Christian tradition; it explains the exceptive phrasing which heretics, past and present, formal or material, have used in support of error.

T. CONSIDINE.

Mary, The Universal Dispenser of Graces

Summary:

Introduction: question to be discussed.

I. *Teaching of the Popes.*
Citations from Pius IX, Leo XIII, S .Pius X ,Benedict XV, Pius XI, Pius XII. Consistency and force of papal teaching.

II. *Argument from Tradition.*
Method of arguing. Influence and teaching of S. Alphonsus in the "Glories of Mary." Theologians and writers before S. Alphonsus—controversialists, theologians, spiritual writers of the Catholic reaction-preachers, spiritual writers.

Contemporary theologians admit with moral unanimity that the Mother of God is rightfully hailed as the dispenser of all graces.[1] Later on in this paper we shall try to determine the exact certitude of the doctrine on which this title is founded. We shall also briefly consider whether the general statement that all graces come through Mary is one that admits of no exception. Since the Assumption, at least, must each and every grace come through her intercession, or are there rare and extraordinary cases in which this need not be so?[2]

Various subsidiary questions will here be ignored, fascinating as they are for the lover of Mary anxious to scrutinise to the full the wondrous power God has placed in her hands. Such questions are concerned, for instance, with the problem whether she exercised her role as universal dispenser of graces while still on earth, or with the nature of her power: is it merely intercessory, or has she a true instrumental efficiency in the distribution of graces?

One other preliminary point calls for a moment's elucidation. Our proposition means considerably more than that Mary dispenses all graces in actual fact: it means she dispenses them *de iure,* to do so is the fulfillment of the office assigned her by Almighty God so that according to His Free Decree her intercession is a necessary condition for the distribution of graces to men.[3]

The arguments for this privilege of Mary have been well thrashed out and discussed since they were put by St. Alphonsus de Liguori over

---

[1]cfr. the eminent mariologist Fr. C. Dillenschneider, C.SS.R., in "Pietas Alphonsiana Erga Matrem Gloriosam Mariam" (C.SS.R. section of Acts of Marian Congress, Rome, 1950, p. 85-86).

[2]For this distinction cfr. Dillenschneider 1. cit. Bittremieux: "De Mediatione Universali B.M. Virginis quoad gratias", p. 228.

[3]We leave aside the question of Mary's influence on the grace and glory of the angels. cfr. Bittremieux, 1 cit., p. 230-243.

two hundred years ago in his immortal work, "The Glories of Mary",[4] and re-inforced by weighty authority and the development of Marian doctrine since the Holy Doctor's time they have long since carried the day. For the honour of God's Holy Mother we shall try to summarise them again bringing out, to the best of our power, their cogency and inner coherence with the rapidly rising and expanding structure of Marian theology in this Marian age.

TEACHING OF THE ROMAN PONTIFFS.

What for every Catholic, be he pastor, theologian or simple believer, puts our thesis beyond all reasonable doubt is its constant reiteration with increasing emphasis and clarity by every Pope from Pius IX to Pius XII still gloriously reigning.[5] Later on the exact weight of their authority will be more accurately estimated, it sufficing to note for present purposes that such Papal utterances command not only our external submission but also our internal assent.[6] We shall quote from these great Vicars of Christ according to the order of their succession and with such brief comments as seem necessary.

(i) *Pius IX*:

In the solemn document, the Bull "Ineffabilis Deus", in which he finally and infallibly gave to the Christian world the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception he exhorts all to honour, invoke and pray to the Immaculate Virgin Mother with ever increasing love and piety. He continues: "There is nothing to fear and no room for despair under her guidance and with her patronage, favour and protection: she has truly maternal sentiments in our regard and in looking after our salvation is concerned with the welfare of all humanity. The Lord has appointed her Queen of heaven and earth so that exalted above all the choirs of angels and ranks of the saints and standing at the right hand of her only Begotten Son Our Lord Jesus Christ she obtains favours most effectively by her maternal pleadings, finds what she seeks and cannot

---

[4]For the immense influence of the "Glories of Mary", see vol. 1 of Fr. Dillenschneider's standard work, "La Mariologie de St. Alphonse", p. 253-289, J. Riviere (quoted by Dillenschneider in "Pietas Alphonsiana", p. 71) refers to it as "the faithful echo of the entire Marian tradition of past ages and an instrument of modern Mariology". See also F. Connell, C.SS.R.: "The Glories of Mary and its author" in Am. Ecc. Rev., May, 1949, p. 398-406.

[5]Benedict XIV and Pius VII could also be quoted, the former calling Mary "a heavenly canal through which streams of all graces and gifts are conveyed to mortals" and the latter "the dispenser of all graces" (cfr. Bittremieux, p. 149, 150; Roschini: "Compendium Mariologiae", p. 294-295).

[6]Pius XII in "Humani Generis", AAS, 1950, p. 568.

be denied" ("maternis suis precibus validissime impetrat, et quod quaerit invenit ac frustrari non potest").[7]

Superficially taken this passage does not seem to teach that Mary is the *de iure* dispenser of all graces, but simply that prayer to her is an efficacious means of obtaining divine favours, since whatever she asks she obtains. However, a little consideration shows much more is implied, for we are told why she has such power with God. It is because of her God bestowed dignity as Queen of Heaven, her closeness to Jesus Christ and her maternal solicitude for all men. Further study, especially of subsequent papal statements, will show how these various attributes of Mary connaturally include her office as the Dispenser of all graces. At any rate it is completely clear that Mary intercedes for us perpetually in all that concerns our salvation ("maternum sane in nos gerens animum nostraeque salutis negotia tractans de universo genere humano est solicita") and since her intercession is infallibly efficacious it follows that the result of it is a perpetual stream of graces for men.

(ii) *Leo XIII*:

The teaching of this great Pontiff is so explicit that a few quotations will suffice without any commentary being necessary.

Thus in the Encyclical "Octobri Mense" of September 22, 1891, he says: "Therefore (on account of her consent to the Incarnation as the context shows) we may with no less propriety and truth affirm that we can receive absolutely nothing from that great treasury of all grace which the Lord has brought forth...nothing, unless, God so willing, it is bestowed on us through Mary. So that, just as no one can have access to the Father Most High except through the Son, so, in almost the same way, no one can have access to the Son except through the Mother".[8]

Again in the "Adiutricem populi" of September 5, 1895, we read: "By God's design she began (from the time of her Assumption) so to watch over the Church and be so near us and so to foster us as our Mother, that she who has been the ministress of the mystery of redemption (quae sacramenti redemptionis administra fuit) might also be the ministress of grace to come from it to every moment of time (eadem

---

[7]Bourasse: "Summa Aurea", vol. 7, col. 640.

[8]Translation by Palmer, S.J.: "Mary in the Documents of the Church" (1952, p. 91-92), cfr. Denziger, n. 1940.

gratiae ex illo in omne tempus derivandae esset pariter administra), almost immense power having been given Her.[9]

(iii) *St. Pius X*:

The most important document from this saintly successor of St. Peter is the well known Encyclical "Ad Diem Illum" (Feb. 2, 1904), written to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the definition of the Immaculate Conception. In it he expounds the place of Mary in the entire economy of human salvation along with and subject to her Son. As part of her universal mediatorship he sees her office as the dispenser of all the graces of Redemption. Thus he writes: "Because...she transcends all others in holiness and in the intimacy of her union with Christ, and because she has been drawn by Christ into association with the work of human salvation, she merits for us congruously, as they say, what Christ merited for us condignly, and she is the principal Minister of the graces to be distributed".[10]

(iv) *Benedict XV*:

Like his two immediate predecessors, Benedict clearly inculcates the doctrine that Mary dispenses all graces and sees this office of hers as part of her mediation in the whole work of Redemption. His words in his Apostolic Letter, "Inter Sodalicia", are amongst the best known and most quoted in modern Marian theology. We quote the part that refers to our present theme: "For this reason (i.e. Mary's compassion or share in Christ's Passion) whatever kind of grace we receive from the treasury of Redemption they are all ministered to us from the hands of the Most Sorrowful Virgin".[11]

(v) *Pius XI*:

The Pope of the Missions has followed the line of the Popes who went before him in sounding the praises of Mary and has enriched Marian theology with a vast number of official utterances covering almost its entire range.[12] It is not surprising, then, to find him referring

---

[9]Latin text given by Bittremieux, p. 151, Roschini, p. 295, who give other quotations. For fuller discussion of Leo's teaching see Bittremieux: "Doctrina Mariana Leonis XIII".

[10]Translation by Palmer, p. 96.

[11]AAS 1918, p. 182, Bittremieux (p. 152-153) and Friethoff, O.P. (De Alma Socia Christi Mediatoris, p. 182, n. 1) give further citations. The former quotes the notable words of the Pope at the Beatification of Joan of Arc when he said that miracles wrought through the intercession of a saint must still be attribued to Mary whose intercession is necessarily presupposed, called as she is by the Church Fathers "mediatrix omnium mediatorum". It was also Benedict who conceded the Mass and Office of the Mediatrix of all graces (ibid).

[12]Roschini: "Le Mariologia di Pio XI".

many times to her office as the dispensatrix of all graces. Thus he calls her "mediatrix of all graces with God", "administress and mediatrix of grace", "administress of the heavenly graces".[13]

He explains that the necessity of having recourse to Mary arises from the fact that "While God gives graces, Mary obtains and distributes them", and elsewhere states: "We know that everything comes to us from the Supreme Omnipotent God through the hands of the Madonna".[14]

(vi) *Pius XII*:

Quite probably history will salute the Pope who has proclaimed the Marian year, who has defined Mary's Assumption and has consecrated the entire human race to her Immaculate Heart as the greatest in the ever lengthening line of Marian Popes. In his allocutions, radio messages, familiar discourses and Encyclicals, he has returned again to the great themes of Marian theology and always with the practical purpose of increasing our devotion to her. Thus he speaks of her dignity, her Queenship, her holiness, her maternal love for all her children, her association with her Son in the Redemption of the human race, the power of her intercession with God and, of course, her office as the Dispenser of all graces.

Scarcely anything he has ever said of her fails to imply this last prerogative for he sees her always as inseparably associated with her Son in the fight against and triumph over evil.[15] We shall briefly relate his teaching on the power of Mary's intercession as found in five Encyclicals—documents addressed to the Universal Church as its Supreme Head on earth.

(a) *"Mystici Corporis"* (On the Mystical Body, 29 June, 1943).[16]

The epilogue paints an unforgettable picture of Mary's association with Jesus in the Sacrifice of Redemption as she stood at the foot of the Cross and goes on from there to describe her impetratory power in Heaven: "May the most holy Mother of all the members of Christ... who reigns now along with her Son, strive in every possible way

---

[13]References are respectively to "Cognitum Sane" (AAS, 1926, p. 213), "Miserentissimus Redemptor" (AAS, 1928, p. 73), "Solemne Semper" (AAS, 1932, p. 376).

[14]ibid. "Ingravescentibus Malis" (AAS, 1937, p. 380). This Encyclical quotes St. Bernard's: "totum nos habere voluit (Deus) per Mariam" (p. 375).

[15]Especially in "Munificentissimus Deus" defining Mary's Assumption (AAS, 1950, p. 753-773): "arctissime coniunctam in certamine illo adversus inferorum hostem" (p. 768).

[16]AAS, 1943, p. 193-248.

through her prayers with Him that from its sublime Head there may flow to all the members of the Mystical Body uninterrupted and most abundant streams of graces".[17]

If Mary as the Mother of the Mystical Body is by her prayers to see to it that there is a constant flow of grace to men, then it must be her office, flowing from her spiritual maternity, to dispense all graces to her children.

(b) *"Mediator Dei"* (On the Liturgy, 20th November, 1947).[18]

Explaining the very special place of Mary in the Liturgy and the honour given her above that given to the other saints, the Holy Father points out that "by reason of her God-given function, her life is most closely interwoven with the mysteries of Jesus Christ" and concludes that no one enjoys greater favour with "the Sacred Heart of the Son of God and through It with the heavenly Father". Reminding us of her holiness and fullness of grace he tells us to commit ourselves with confidence entirely to her patronage as our Mother and then with a quotation from St. Bernard we have already seen used by Pius XI[19] affirms in the most explicit way possible that Mary distributes all graces: "She gives us her Son and, with Him, all the helps we need; for God "has so willed us to have everything through Mary".[20]

(c) *"Ingruentium Malorum"* (On the Holy Rosary, Sept. 15, 1951).[21]

Recalling how from the beginning of his pontificate he has again and again commended the human race engulfed in the tide of modern evils to the unfailing protection of the Mother of God, he now returns to that theme in recommending to all the recitation of the Holy Rosary. While we have the divine promise of the efficacy of prayer, there is no place for despondency. Hence he emits a trumpet call: "With more ardent confidence fly in the spontaneous sincerity of your hearts to the Virgin Mother of God, recourse to whom has always been a principal and solemn duty of the Christian people in times of peril". The reason for such recourse he gives in the words of St. Irenaeus: "she has been constituted the cause of salvation for the entire human race".[22] In the context it is clear that the Pope here affirms that Mary dispenses the graces whereby salvation may come to all. We pray to her not only

---

[17]ibid, p. 248.
[18]AAS, 1947, p. 521-95.
[19]see above p. 228, n. 14.
[20]p. 582. Eng. vers. CTS (Lond.), p. 71-72.
[21]AAS, p. 577-82.
[22]ibid, p. 577.

as to the one who gave us Christ at the Incarnation, but also as to one from whom salvation comes throughout the centuries and that can only be because she distributes the fruits of Redemption.

(d) *"Fulgens Corona"* (Proclaiming the Marian Year, 8th September, 1953).[23]

In this characteristically fervent and beautifully worded letter, so rich in Marian doctrine and piety, the Pope does not explicitly say that all graces are distributed by Mary. Still there can be no doubt that her office as the dispenser of all graces is in his mind when he tells us to recommend our own needs, the needs of the Church and the needs of the whole world to Mary, the Mother who loves us with a love exceeding the love of all earthly mothers—"dulcissima Mater nostra, quae nos profecto plus quam terrenae omnes genetrices veraci caritate diligit".[24]

(e) *"Ad Coeli Reginam"* (Encyclical on Mary's regal dignity and the etablishment of the Feast of Her Queenship).[25]

The latest Marian Encyclical explicitly teaches Mary's role as the Universal Dispensatrix of graces, inasmuch as it is part of her queenly dignity, founded on her intimate association with Jesus in the work of Redemption. "From this association with Christ there comes that royal power, whereby she is able to dispense the treasures of the Kingdom of the Divine Redeemer: finally from this association with Christ results the unlimited efficacy ("elicitur exhausta nunquam efficacia") of her maternal protection with the Father and the Son".[26]

In bringing to a close the above survey of Papal teaching for the last hundred years and more on Mary's office as the dispenser of graces, the question arises as to what certainty we can now assign to it.

It is not claimed that any single one of these utterances is infallible, but each of them comes from the head of the Church and practically every one we have cited is addressed to the universal Church. One such statement would be enough to make morally certain the truth it expresses,[27] but we are in the presence of a century long series of them.

---

[23]AAS, p. 577-592.

[24]ibid, p. 585. Also the Pope's prayer for the Marian year breathes the same absolute confidence in Mary's power implicitly assuming everything comes through her.

[25]AAS, 1954, p. 625-640.

[26]ibid, p. 635. Later in the same document the Pope re-affirms the teaching of Pius IX, Leo XIII, and St. Pius X, which we have noted above (p. 636-637).

[27]As pertaining to the Pope's ordinary Magisterium (AAS, 1950, p. 568). Salaverri S.I. (De Ecclesia, 1952, n. 645-49) regards this Magisterium as infallible but, it seems, with little probability (cfr. Stirnimann, O.P., in "Freiburger Zeitschrift fuer Philosophie und Theologie", 1954, p. 17-47).

There is no hint in any of them that the Pope is merely expressing a pious and tenable opinion,[28] but all of them are clear unequivocal statements of a definite truth. It is a truth on which we are invited to base our confidence in Mary and in view of which we are told to redouble our supplications to her. The only result of such definite and long continued statements from the head of the Church is the firm implanting in the minds of all the faithful of the conviction that all graces come through Mary's hands, for the teaching of the Sovereign Pontiff is re-echoed and amplified in theological schools, in pastoral instructions, in works of popular instruction and devotion.

The Holy Spirit is with the Church always, which makes it inconceivable that the Sovereign Pontiffs should for the last hundred years have been leading it into error. Moreover, once there is universal error in a point of doctrine, infallibility is no longer there. Consequently, to contradict what they say of Mary's mediation in distributing graces would be to commit a grave error.

THE VOICE OF TRADITION.

We are thus in possession of Mary's universal mediation in the distribution of graces as an integral part of Catholic doctrine. It is taught by the ordinary Magisterium of the Roman Pontiff and is re-echoed on the lips of thousands of loyal pastors and preachers as well as in the hearts of countless faithful all over the world. Obviously this teaching cannot be an invention of the modern Church, whose office is to protect and interpret not to add to the deposit of faith. If it is not one of the truths explicitly delivered to the Church in Apostolic times, it must have a necessary connection with some such truth or truths either as a part or aspect that has become clear with the unfolding of the deposit through the centuries or as something necessarily following therefrom. It is now our task to trace briefly the course of the Christian conviction that Mary dispenses all graces or to discover it included either explicitly or implicitly in the stream of the living tradition of the Christian Church.

Recent controversy amongst theologians culminating in the issue of the important Encyclical "Humani Generis" has once again highlighted the importance we attach in the argument from tradition to the living voice of the Magisterium. The positive theologian who would

---

[28]Papal documents make it clear when something is proposed as merely an opinion, as does "Casti Connubii" (AAS, 1930, p. 583, citing an opinion of St. Robert Bellarmine).

essay to find in the monuments of past ages some doctrine now taught by the modern Church is not in the position of an historian, whose rigorous method forbids him to draw any certain conclusion not warranted by the evidence those monuments provide. He knows what the Church teaches in the present age has come down in a continuous stream of doctrine from the Apostles and that this living tradition is not to be confounded with the writings of the past that bear witness to its existence. What is, or appears to be, uncertain or obscure in the writings of the Fathers or theologians of past ages, or in the utterances of the Magisterium in former times, must be interpreted by what is certain and clear in the teaching of the Magisterium or the universal conviction of the faithful now.[29]

Thus an argument from tradition can lead to fallacious and dangerous consequences if its starting point is not the contemporary Magisterium, for the living Magisterium is the perpetual organ of tradition or the oral teaching given to the Church by Christ and the Apostles, not all of which was committed to writing, and hence in some sense is identical with active tradition itself.[30]

Consequently in considering and evaluating the testimony of the past in reference to the role of Mary in the distribution of graces, we must constantly keep in mind what we hold as a certain truth because of the present teaching of the Holy See. Looking back over past centuries from the present, rather than looking down them to our own age, let us find and examine what those centuries have to say of Mary's part in the dispensing of grace to men.[31]

---

[29]The words of the Pope run thus: "Hac de causa theologia etiam positiva, quam dicunt, scientiae dumtaxat historicae aequari nequit. Una enim cum sacris eiusmodi fontibus Deus Ecclesiae suae Magisterium vivum dedit, ad ea quoque illustranda et enucleanda, quae in fidei deposito nonnisi obscure ac velut implicite continentur...Si autem hoc suum munus Ecclesia exercet, sicut saeculorum decursu saepenumero factum est...patet omnino falsam esse methodum, quo ex obscuris clara explicantur, quin immo contrarium omnes sequi ordinem necesse est" (AAS, 1950, p. 569). cfr. Congar, O.P., art. "Theologie" in "Dictionnaire de Theol. Cath.", vol. 15, 1 col. 467-471. Simonin, O.P., in "Angelicum", 1938, p. 409-418. Filograssi, S.J., "De Santissima Eucharistia" (1952), p. 18-22. See recent Papal statement on method in Mariology. AAS, 1954, p. 677-680.

[30]Card. Franzelin states: "Vivens magisterium demonstratur perpetuum organon Traditionis Christiamae" (De Div. Traditione et Scriptura ed. 3 (1882), p. 30, and Billot: "Traditio ipsa est praedicatio ab aevo in aevum continuata per apostolorum successores sub chrismate assistentiae S. Sancti, revelationis ab eodem Jesu Christe eiusque apostolis primitus acceptae" (De Immutabilitate Traditionis", p. 13).

[31]Theologians have not failed to remark that the Bull "Munificentissimus" in presenting the arguments for the Assumption has used this retrogressive method—"ex ordinarii Ecclesiae Magisterii consensu certum et firmum sumitur argumen-

(i) *"The Glories of Mary"*:

We commence our retrogressive survey with the Marian classic of St. Alphonsus, not because nothing of value on our question has been written since, or, still less, because the stream of tradition dried up with its publication, but because its appearance marked the close of an epoch, and ensured victory for the champions of Mary in the theological battle that had been waged about her place in the economy of salvation and the spiritual life since the sixteenth century. The Saint's thesis that all graces come to us through her hands was the clearest and fullest expression of that spontaneous conviction of age old Christian piety, which is the basis of our unswerving confidence in her protection and our practice of having recourse to her in all our needs, trials and adversities. The surety and solidity of the Saint's presentation of his favourite Marian thesis with the reasons supporting it, the essentially popular scope of his book, together with its phenomenally wide diffusion,[32] could have only one result—the universal acceptance of the doctrine that all graces pass to us through the hands of Mary. There can be no doubt that under the guidance of God the influence of Alphonsus has been the great factor which has led to its high standing in the Church at the present time, supported as it is by the express approbation of the Vicars of Jesus Christ.[33]

Introducing his book the Saint makes it clear that its purpose is to inculcate the necessity and efficacy of devotion to Mary, and promises to prove what he himself holds as true "that all graces are dispensed only through the hands of Mary".[34]

The first part of the work is a commentary on the "Salve Regina". Explaining the words—"to Thee do we send up our sighs in this valley of tears"—the Saint sets forth his proposition—that the intercession of Mary is not only useful but morally necessary for our salvation, the necessity arising from the Will of God Who, as St. Bernard teaches, wishes that all graces be dispensed to us through the hands of Mary.[35]

---

tum" (AAS, 1950, p. 757). Using this consent as his guide the Pope finds the doctrine in the testimonies of tradition. cfr. Frs. Labourdette and Nicholas, O.P., in "Revue Thomiste", 1950, 11, p. 252-257.

[32]According to Fr. D. Capone, C.SS.R., in the Roman Marian Congress of 1950, since its appearance in Oct., 1750, it has been translated into 18 languages and has gone through more than 752 different editions ("Pietas Alfonsiana", p. 59-70).

[33]cfr. Dublanchy, S.M., art. "Marie" in Dict. de Théol. Cath., vol. 9, 2, col. 2402-2403.

[34]Critical Italian ed. of Roschini, O.S.M., p. 23.

[35]"Sentenza di S. Bernardo che oggidi può ben assersi commune fra' teologie dottori" (p. 190).

This he claims to be the common teaching of theologians and doctors, adding a few pages further on that such is the sentiment of the Church with St. Bernard.[36] Alphonsus supports his thesis with an abundance of citations from theologians, spiritual writers and Fathers,[37] draws on the Liturgy for confirmation and bases it ultimately on what Scripture and Tradition have to tell us of Mary's close association with her Son in the work of Redemption.[38]

As we shall see, Alphonsus' claim that the doctrine of Mary's universal mediation in the distribution of graces is the teaching of authoritative writers and preachers in the Church for many centuries is completely valid, and he himself defended it successfully against the erudite Muratori,[39] as well as all those who with him allowed the blight of Jansenism to chill the ardour of their Marian piety. Alphonsus' work is the culminating point and spearhead of the Catholic re-action against the aspersions cast by rationalistic humanism, Protestantism and Jansenism on traditional Catholic devotion to the Mother of God which implicitly assumes that under the One Mediator she is the principal dispenser of divine grace.[40] In this vindication of Mary by theologians and writers of the two centuries which preceded Alphonsus, we shall find many explicit statements of our theme.

(ii) *The Catholic Re-action*:

In the first volume of his authoritative and scholarly work, "La Mariologie de S. Alphonse", Fr. Dillenschnieder, C.SS.R., traces the course of Marian teaching in outstanding Catholic theologians, controversialists and spiritual writers from the period of the Council of Trent to the appearance of the "Glories of Mary". These are men who defended orthodox Catholic teaching on devotion to Mary against the effects of the errors mentioned above. For the most part they do not, as St.

---

[36]"sente la chiesa con s. Bernardo, che Dio ha determinato che niuna grazia a noi si dispensi se non per mano di Maria" (p. 201).

[37]Naturally modern textual criticism has discovered some inaccuracies in the Saint's references and quotations, but it has only confirmed his general claim. We have two editions of the Italian text with necessary corrections—that published by the Redemptorists in vol. vi of "Opere Ascetiche" (Rome, 1935) with full critical apparatus and the small one of Roschini (Rome, 1944), from which we quote.

[38]p. 206-221.

[39]p. 191-202. cfr. Dillenschneider, "La Mariologie de S. Alphonse", vol. I, p. 303-327, for a careful weighing of the value of the Saint's apologetic in the light of modern Patristic research, and theological reasoning.

[40]For a proper appreciation of the place of Alphonsus in the stream of Marian doctrine, especially in what concerns her distribution of graces, the first volume of the work of Fr. Dillenschneider referred to in the previous note is indispensable. The points we have mentioned above there receive a full and abundantly documented treatment.

Alphonsus, propound the doctrine we are considering as a formal thesis but they state it many times, not as a mere pious opinion, but as something pieced into the very convictions of the Christian people. Following the divisions of Fr. Dillenschneider into controversialists, theologians and spiritual writers, and culling our matter mostly from his pages, we shall give some citations following broadly a retrogressive order under each head.

(a) *Controversialists*:

An author hardly known these days, but whose testimony is of the greatest importance for our theme which he presents with rare scholastic competence and with a fullness equalled only by St. Alphonsus himself, is the Flemish Dominican *Joh. Bap. Van Ketwigh* in his "Panoplia Mariana".[41] He presents his teaching on Mary's part in the distribution of grace in five propositions, all of which can be found in the explicit teaching of "The Glories of Mary" thirty years later. We quote the first and the second only—"Omnia bona, quae fidelibus suis largitur Deus, erogat per manus Maria, atque hoc modo eam vult honorare" and "Nulla creatura aliquam a Deo obtinet gratiam, nisi secundum ipsius pissimae Matris dispensationem".[42]

St. Robert Bellarmine, who died 1621, and *St. Peter Canisius,* who died in 1597, are both doctors of the Church and both are explicit proponents of our doctrine. The former in his sermons takes up the idea of St. Bernardine of Siena that Mary performs the function of the neck in the Mystical Body transmitting all graces from Christ into the Church;[43] Canisius has left us a Marian apology called—"De Maria Virgine incomparabili et Dei Genetrice sacrosancta libri quinque"—in which he shows himself a partaker of the sentiment that Mary dispenses all graces by comparing her fullness of grace to the fullness of a river on which as rivulets depend the flow of graces given to the saints.[44]

(b) *Theologians*:

In his "Theologia Mentis et Cordis" *Vincent Contenson, O.P.,* has beautiful things to say of Mary's part in communicating to us the true life which is Christ, inspiring himself with the dictum of St. Bernard—

---

[41] See Dillenschneider, p. 145-150, for a full account of this work published in 1720.

[42] loc. cit., p. 148.

[43] loc. cit., p. 117-118, cfr. "Mary Mediatrix in the Theology of Bellarmine" (Hom. and Past. Rev., Nov., 1947, p. 81-97), by J. Harden, S.J., especially p. 95.

[44] "Plenitudo Christi quasi fontis, Mariae quasi fluminis, et sanctorum quasi rivi, a flumine descendentis" (Quoted from Bourasse, "Summa Aurea", t. viii, col. 1057).

"plena sibi, superplena nobis". His conception of Mary's part in our soul life clearly supposes that she is continually moulding it by constantly dispensing grace: "Maria vita est, per quam Vita Christus nobis advenit...Per ipsam nos suscipiet, qui per ipsam nobis est datus".[45]

We must now mention two illustrious theologians of the Society of Jesus whose incredible erudition, comprehensive grasp of Catholic tradition and outstanding orthodoxy make them unsurpassed interpreters of the sense of the Church and the faithful. They are *Denis Petau* or *Petavius,* who died in the middle of the seventeenth century, and *Francis Suarez,* who died almost forty years earlier.

In his classic work of positive theology—"Dogmata Theologia"—and as part of his treatise on the Incarnation, Petavius takes up the question of Mary's mediation, which, he declares, includes not only her association with Christ on earth, but also her intercession for us in Heaven. Invoking the authority of many Fathers and theologians, he states that as our secondary mediator Mary intervenes to obtain for us grace and pardon, her mediation being secondary to that of Christ but above that of all the saints.[46] It is true he does not say explicitly *all* graces come through her intercession, but the clarity and emphasis of his words in assigning to her in a secondary way what belongs primarily to her Son would be pointless if Mary's intervention were less than universal.

Suarez, too, does not set out ex professo to prove our thesis, but aims at establishing that she intercedes for us and that we are bound to invoke her. He finds both these assertions to be of faith—"ex communi usu et consensu totius Ecclesiae".[47] The second of them he supports with a reason which, precisely, is the teaching of St. Bernard that all graces come through Mary: "Qui, ut Bernardus dixit, illa est mediatrix ad mediatorem, et veluti collum per quod influentiae capitis ad corpus descendunt".[48]

(c) *Spiritual Writers*:

In this group we confine ourselves to canonised saints, or to those eminent for holiness, the best guides in finding out the *sensus fidelium* in any question, since they are so full of it themselves, and by their writing and preaching do so much to foster and propagate it.

---

[45]Dillenschneider, p. 183.

[46]Lib. 14, ch. 9, ed. Vives, 1867, p. 94-96.

[47]"De Mysteriis Vitae Christi" Opera Omnia (Ed. Vives, 1866), vol. 19, Q. 38, siap. 23, sec. 3, n. 2, p. 335 (cfr. sec. 2, n. 3).

[48]loc. cit., n. 5, p. 336.

A noted missioner of his time, the holy Franciscan *St. Leonard of Port Maurice,* was a contemporary and fellow countryman of St. Alphonsus.

The emphasis of his Marian preaching is on the necessity of devotion to her for salvation, based on the doctrine of her universal mediation in the distribution of graces, so that every good thought, every good movement of the will and every good sentiment of the heart is due to her.[49] Another eminent witness of the *sensus Ecclesiae,* St. Francis de Sales, Doctor of the Church, in a sermon on the Visitation sees in the fact that St. Elizabeth received the Holy Spirit through Mary an instructive lesson that we must receive grace in the same way.[50] An Italian contemporary of St. Francis, the Capuchin, *St. Laurence of Brindisi,* is another energetic propounder of Mary's universal mediation. Making a beautiful application of the metaphor comparing Mary in the Mystical Body to a neck in the human body, he says that as the neck inclines the head so through Mary does God incline that we may obtain mercy, since "per Mariam...descendunt gratiae a Deo in Ecclesiam".[51]

An important school of spirituality which arose and flourished during this epoch is the Berullean school, so called after its illustrious and saintly founder, *Cardinal de Berulle,* the inaugurator of the French Oratory, who died in 1629. Its representatives, besides de Berulle himself, include such eminently holy people as *John Olier, John Eudes,* and *Grignon de Montfort*—the last two canonised saints. Its emphasis is devotion to the Word Incarnate Whose divine life we share. However, it is shared most fully by Mary Who as His Mother is inseparably linked with Jesus wherever He is found, and hence also in the life of our souls. Jesus, therefore, lives and reigns in us only through Mary.

Thus for de Berulle himself "to speak of Jesus is to speak of Mary", Who is inseparably His Mother as the Eternal Father is eternally His Father. A soul stamped with His image in Baptism belongs inevitably to Mary by a kind of holy servitude.[52] Olier describes her as "a veritable sacrament...She bears in herself Jesus Christ, source of all graces, and the Holy Spirit, as well as all the gifts He has acquired and merited during His whole life".[53] St. John Eudes preached devo-

---

[49]Dillenschneider, p. 226.
[50]l cit., p. 197.
[51]l cit., p. 217.
[52]l cit., p. 230-234.
[53]l cit., p. 235-236.

tion to the divine heart of Mary which is "Jesus Himself".[54] St. Grignon de Montfort's "True Devotion" is too well known to need more than a mention here, but obviously it means nothing if Mary is not the dispenser of all graces.

In closing our survey of this period, two significant features should be pointed out. The first is the emphasis with which it is stated that all graces come through Mary—not as a pious opinion but as a definite assertion. It is not something to be weighed carefully in theological schools, but a thing to be taught and preached to the people as part of Catholic doctrine. The second thing is that, for all its definiteness, even in theological writings, authors rarely propose the doctrine as a set thesis assembling formal proofs in its support. This indicates how deeply Mary's universal mediation has penetrated the minds and convictions of theologians, preachers and ordinary faithful. It is something of a first principle in Marian piety, the stock justification of devotion to her. Only when the attacks of Protestants, Jansenists and other minimisers have forced Catholics back on their principles, does it become necessary to defend the principle itself, and, in God's wonderful Providence, this necessity produces the most popular and influential book ever written on the Mother of God—"The Glories of Mary".

A. REGAN, C.SS.R.

(To be continued)

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE

"THE DIVINE MASTERPIECE," by Gabriel M. Roschini, O.S.M., 136 XIV pp. Mercier Press, Cork.

The "Divine Masterpiece" is the Blessed Virgin Father Roschini has provided us here with a small and easily read compendium of Mariology. Beginning with a treatment of Mary's position in the prophecies and symbols of the Old Testament, the first section of the book deals with her role as Mother of God and consequent relation to mankind. The greater part of the book is given over to a very logical defence of Mary's privileges, both in the supernatural and natural orders. Finally we have a discussion on the veneration which is due to Mary because of her part in God's redemptive plan and her spiritual perfection.

Although this is primarily the work of a speculative theologian it is also extremely devotional, calculated to excite the love of a child for his Mother. Any theological terms are carefully explained, thus making it a book which could be read with profit by the laity. An appendix contains an English translation of the Bull. "Munificentissimus Deus," in which Pius XII defined the dogma of Our Lady's Assumption.

R.J.E.

---

[54] cit., p. 239.

Dogmatic Theology

DOCTRINAL ASPECTS OF THE SUNDAY

On the summit of Mount Sinai God spoke to Moses and delivered the commandment of worship. "Remember thou keep holy the sabbath day. Six days shalt thou labour, and shalt do all thy work. But on the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: thou shalt do no work on it . . . For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them, and rested on the seventh day: therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it."[1]

In the life of the Christian, Sunday occupies a place similar to that of the sabbath among the Jews. But there is a profound difference between the two institutions. The sacred day of the New Testament is imbued with a spirit, and enriched with a theology, thoroughly Christian.[2]

THE LORD'S DAY

In the New Testament the expression *the Lord's day,* which has since been officially adopted by the Church to designate the Sunday, makes its one and only appearance in the Apocalypse of St. John. "I John, your brother and copartner in Jesus in the tribulation and in the kingdom and in the patience, came to be in the island which is called Patmos, for the sake of the word of God and my witness to Jesus. I was rapt in spirit on *the Lord's day,* and I heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet, saying: What thou beholdest, write in a book, and send to the seven churches."[3] It might well have been that the exile of Patmos, separated from the community of Ephesus on the day when they came together to celebrate the Eucharist and the Resurrection of Christ, was consoled by the thought that on this same day, Sunday, he too was favoured, but in a different way, with the presence of the risen Saviour. For in the vision granted to him on the Lord's day, the son of Man appeared to the apostle as the risen Lord Who had conquered death for ever.[4]

The Christian Sunday is the Lord's day, because it commemorates the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. This day is the weekly

---

[1]Exodus, 20, 8-11.

[2]This article is much indebted for its principal themes to the work of J. Gaillard, art. Dimanche, D.S. col. 951-982.

[3]Apoc. 1, 9-11.

[4]Cfr. H. Dumaine, art. Dimanche, DACL, c. 888.

celebration of Christ's victory over death and of the entire mystery of the Redemption. We appoint Sunday for the assembly of the faithful, wrote St. Justin, because on that same day Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead. From the third century onwards the word Sunday itself is frequently replaced by the expression *the day of the Resurrection.*

In accordance with this concept the Sunday is also regarded as a weekly Pasch. The historical events of Christ's death and resurrection were accomplished during the days when the people of Israel celebrated the Pasch of the old law. The redemptive mystery inaugurates the Pasch of Christians. This is the reality and fulfilment to which the shadow and promise of the ancient feast gives place. The celebration of the new Pasch of Christ is not an annual event like that of the Jews. For Christ has instituted a lasting memorial of his redemptive sacrifice in the Eucharist. "After he celebrated the Old Pasch, which the assembly of the people of Israel offered in memory of the passage from Egypt, Christ instituted the new Pasch. He Himself was this new Pasch, to be offered by the Church through her priests under visible signs, in memory of His departure from this world to the Father when by the shedding of His Blood He redeemed us from the power of darkness and transferred us into His Kingdom."[5]

Although every offering of the Mass is the celebration of the Christian Pasch, the Sunday Mass has a special paschal quality. For the Sunday itself is instituted in honour of Christ's Resurrection. It recalls the glorious triumph of Easter which set the divine seal of acceptance on the sacrifice of the Cross. Every Sunday is the weekly Pasch, just as Easter is the annual Pasch. The Mass itself renews the passage of Christ from this world to the Father, but the Sunday Mass renews the Pasch of Christ on a day which is dedicated to the memory of His Resurrection. Thus the Sunday celebration enables us to participate more intensely in the mystery of Christ's Resurrection and in the life of grace which flows from it.

The relation between the Sunday and the mystery of the Resurrection explains why that day was subsequently regarded as the weekly memorial of Baptism. For in the thought of St. Paul, Baptism is an incorporation into the Resurrection of Christ. "Know ye not, that as many of us as were baptised unto Christ Jesus, we were baptised unto His death? We were buried therefore with Him though this

[5]Council of Trent, session 22, chapter I. Translation from "The Church Teaches," Herder, 1955.

baptism unto death, that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in the newness of life. For if we have become one with Him in the likeness of His death, why, then we shall also be in the likeness of His resurrection."[6] A similar concept forms the basis for the custom of sprinkling the faithful with holy water before the parochial, or solemn, Mass on Sundays. The ceremony of the *Asperges* is a weekly reminder of our participation in Christ's Resurrection through the mystery of Baptism.

The Christian Sunday is dominated by a spirit of joy and happiness which radiates from the risen Christ. At the beginning of the fifth century Innocent I gives voice to an ancient tradition when he says that the paschal joy illumines each Sunday. This notion is given external expression in the liturgy of the Church which excludes from the Sunday every element of penance and fasting, even during the season of Lent. Thus the Sunday is the memorial of Christ's Resurrection, the reminder of our Baptism, the day of paschal joy.

THE SACRED DAY

If the Sunday was originally a day of devotion to the Resurrection of Christ, it was not long before it became the Christian sabbath—the sacred day reserved for the worship of God. The third precept of the decalogue was founded on the natural law which obliges man to pay due homage to God. In the Old Testament this law of nature was determined by a divine positive precept, and the actual selection of the sabbath had a religious significance. The sacred day of the Jews was the memorial both of the creative work of God and of the deliverance of Israel from the slavery of Egypt. The sabbath was a continual reminder of God's bounty and mercy, inspiring the people of Israel to acknowledge the goodness and majesty of their Lord in acts of worship.

The sabbath of the Jews has given place to the Sunday of the Christians. The sacred day selected by the Church is the memorial of benefits which far surpass those of the old dispensation. The Sunday is sanctified by the Resurrection of Christ which heralds the new creation of grace and the true deliverance of men from the slavery of sin. The very day which is reserved for God in the New Law reminds the Christian, overwhelmingly, of his obligations towards a God Who is infinitely rich in mercy and goodness. The Jews, says St. Thomas, kept holy the sabbath in memory of the first creation. But Christ made

[6]Romans, 6, 4-6.

a new creation. This new creation through grace begins in the resurrection. And because the resurrection took place on Sunday, we therefore celebrate that day just as the Jews did the sabbath on account of the first creation.[7]

The definite act of worship by which the Christian community honours God on its sacred day, is the offering of the sacrifice of the New Law. The Mystery of the Eucharist lies at the centre of the Christian religion. By the sacrifice of the Mass there is offered to God that supreme homage by which Christ, the principal offerer, and with Him and through Him, all his mystical members, pay due honour and veneration to God.

For the Jews the observance of the sabbath consisted principally in the complete cessation of work. The Hebrew word sabbath signified cessation, and to keep the sabbath meant to cease from labour and to rest. Under this aspect the primitive church did not consider the Sunday in terms of a Christian sabbath, for a day of rest would have been impracticable in a pagan society. The introduction of the Sunday rest and the prohibition of certain works was a gradual development which progressed with the diffusion of Christianity into all spheres of society, and particularly with the peace of Constantine.

The observance of the Sunday rest is for the Church a means of ensuring the worship of God. For the Fathers, and especially St. Augustine, the cessation of servile work is a sign of the repose of the heart in God, which begins with the cessation of sin, increases with that internal peace which is the fruit of charity, and culminates in the eternal rest of the beatific vision.

The sacred day of rest is far more than a sign of spiritual peace and of the repose of the heart in God. The Sunday observance is a rich source of grace which is the essence of spiritual peace. It acts as a sacramental by the prayers of the Church, and exercises a sanctifying activity by means of the Mass and the Sacraments which it contains. Before His death Christ promised a heritage of peace to His apostles. By His Resurrection and the descent of the Holy Ghost, He placed the Church in possession of the peace of God. The mystery of the Sunday leads the members of the Church into the peace and repose of Christ.

THE CHURCH'S DAY

The Sunday is essentially a day of community worship, a day

[7]De Duobus Praeceptis

when all the faithful come together to celebrate the Lord's supper, a day when the members of the Church gather around the table of the Lord to offer a supreme homage to God and enter into sacramental union with Christ. It is only natural that the Sunday should have been regarded as the day of the Church. For the word Church means in fact an assemblage, and the Sunday Mass is an assemblage of the faithful which manifests the very properties of the Church. These properties are inherent in the liturgy itself, but receive an added emphasis because of the special solemnity of the Sunday.

The hierarchic and apostolic nature of the Church was wonderfully displayed in the original form of Mass celebration which prevailed in the first four centuries. The bishop was the central figure in the Sunday assembly; surrounded by his priests and deacons he offered the eucharistic sacrifice in the presence of his entire flock. St. Ignatius of Antioch drew many a lesson from this hierarchical manifestation of the Church at the Sunday Eucharist. "Take care, then, to partake of one Eucharist; for one is the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one the cup to unite us with His blood, and one altar, just as there is one bishop assisted by the presbytery and the deacons, my fellow servants."[8] This form of celebration was retained while Christianity was principally an urban religion; but was gradually abandoned as the faith spread into rural districts. The modern form of Sunday worship does not usually provide such a striking display of the hierarchic nature of the Church; but the note is still plainly manifested in the strict, and obvious, distinction between the priest and the laity, and in the different ways in which they offer the eucharistic sacrifice.

Even before the observance of the Sunday was laid down by the Councils in terms of a strict obligation, the necessity of taking part in the weekly gathering of Christians was envisaged as arising from the need to preserve intact the unity of the Church. To be absent from the Sunday assembly was to diminish the Body of Christ. "Persuade the people to be faithful to the (Sunday) assemblage, so that no one will diminish the Church by being absent, so that the Body of Christ will not be diminished even by one member."[9] The Sunday Mass is a sign of the unity of the Church. All the faithful come together into one body. They are animated by the one faith. They offer the one sacrifice and receive the one bread of eternal life.

---

[8]Ad. Smyrn., 8, 1.
[9]Didascalia 13, cited from J. Gaillard.

THE EIGHTH DAY

The disciples of Christ came together on the first day of the week not only to celebrate the Passion and Resurrection of their Lord, but also to await His return. The expectation of the *parousia,* the second and glorious coming of Christ at the end of the world, held a large place in the thoughts of the apostles. St. Paul links this theme of the second coming of Christ with his theology of the Eucharist. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the death of the Lord until He come."[10]

Sunday was particularly associated with the coming of Christ. The risen Saviour had appeared to His apostles on the Sunday of His Resurrection, and again eight days afterwards. Thus every Sunday was passed in an atmosphere of hope and expectancy, for it held out to Christians the promise and the reminder of the definitive return of Christ.

The second coming of Christ is the summit of Christian hopes, for only then shall we participate fully in the glory of His Resurrection. "In truth, Christ is risen from the dead, the first fruits of them that sleep. For since by a man came death, by a man also cometh resurrection from the dead. For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all shall be made to live. But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, then they that are Christ's shall rise, at His coming."[11] The Sunday is a continual reminder of the heritage promised to Christians, their glorious life with Christ in the repose of God.

This escatological aspect of the Sunday was developed by the Fathers in their reflections on the eighth day. Sunday is normally regarded as the first day of the week; but if it is counted again at the end of the weekly cycle, it becomes the eighth day. St. Justin tells us that the eighth day encloses a mystery. The very name implies that it is different from all others. The eighth day does not pertain to our measure of earthly time; it is reminiscent of another world where time is not measured in moments and hours, but in the eternity of God. The Sunday reminds man continually of the paradox of his life on earth—he is in the world but not of the world. The Sunday preaches a message which may be summed up in the words of St. Paul: "If then ye have risen with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is seated at the right hand of God: mind the things that

[10] I Cor., 11, 26.
[11] I Cor., 15, 20-24.

are above, not the things that are on earth. For ye have died, and your life is hidden with Christ in God: when Christ, our life, shall appear, then also shall ye appear with Him in glory."

C. TIERNEY.

* * * *

"HILAIRE BELLOC: NO ALIENATED MAN," by Frederick Wilhelmsen, published by Sheed & Ward, London, 1954. 108 pp. English price, 7/6.

This little work is neither a biography nor a literary criticism. Rather it is an attempt to introduce the contemporary reader to Belloc and to draw out those elements of his work that are of permanent value.

In 1906 Belloc published "The Four Men," a book which reveals the necessity of harmonising the separate drives in man, if man would be himself. The four characters are the Poet, a man with visions and no money; the Sailor, a fellow in the full flood of life, a singer of songs and a profound realist; the Grizzlebeard, an old man still vigorous against the march of years; and Myself. Frederick Wilhelmsen defends the view that the perfections symbolised by the Poet, the Sailor, the Grizzlebeard, are not the peculiarities of Belloc alone, but are perfections essential to the integral completion of Christian humanity.

Belloc is no alienated man. He is at home with reality. In many ways he has little in common with the age of Sartre and Picasso—the age of man twice alienated from himself, for Modern Man "has his life neither in the rooted things of the world nor in the heaven beyond." The author tries to see Belloc within this new setting and in it his vitality and sanity show forth in full clearness against those, whose minds are attuned only to broken men.

In some 35 pages Belloc's historical theory, based as it is on "traditionalism," is analysed by the author, who deems it "crucially important for fixing the limits of his integrated Christian humanism."

A concluding few pages assess the future place of Hilaire Belloc in English Letters and suggest that New Man when he has tried all the doors leading nowhere, may turn "to the gnarled wisdom and the eternal youth of this last guardian of the West." It is then "he will learn what it means to be a man."

P.McC.

Moral Theology

FACULTIES FOR PRIESTS' CONFESSIONS

Dear Rev. Sir,

Some of my colleagues are of opinion that if they are asked by a priest to hear his confession, whilst they are travelling, they may do so. (They were given faculties by their Bishop to hear confessions in their own Diocese only). Apart from danger of death, etc., is the above opinion correct?

DUBITANS.

REPLY.

The opinion expressed by our correspondent's colleagues has no foundation in the general law. Except the priest penitent is authorised by the Ordinary of the Diocese where the confession is heard to give the necessary faculties to the visitor, the absolution in invalid.[1]

The Sacrament of Penance was instituted by Christ as a tribunal—*per modum iudicii*. The confessor passes a sentence of remission or retention; and as a judge he requires jurisdiction, which is usually referred to as the faculty to hear confessions. Jurisdiction is either ordinary or delegated. Ordinary jurisdiction is attached to an office, and is received at the moment of taking possession of the office.[2] Besides the Supreme Pontiff, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church have ordinary jurisdiction for confessions throughout the whole Church: local Ordinaries and parish priests, which term also includes those who are included as *parochi* in law, have ordinary jurisdiction for their own territory.[3] Delegated jurisdiction is given by an act of the Superior who is competent to grant it. The competent Superior in the case of jurisdiction for confessions is Ordinary of the place where the confession is heard.[4] From the parenthesis of Dubitans' question it might be inferred that the Bishop could give jurisdiction to his priests to hear confessions in another Diocese. A parish priest may hear the confessions of his own subjects everywhere, by reason of his ordinary jurisdiction[5]; but he cannot hear the confessions of others. Delegated

---

[1]If the penitent be a member of an exempt Religious Institute, his Religious Superior is equally competent with the Local Ordinary to grant jurisdiction for his subject's confession. Can. 875, par. 1. To simplify our treatment, we suppose throughout, that the penitent is not an exempt Religious.

[2]Can. 197.

[3]Can. 873.

[4]Can. 874, par. 1.

[5]Can. 881, par. 2.

jurisdiction for confessions does not extend beyond the limits of the Ordinary who grants it, that is, in the case of the local Ordinary, outside the boundaries of his Diocese. A priest penitent, unlike a Bishop or Cardinal, enjoys no special privileges with regard to selecting a confessor, but must conform to the law in the same manner as the faithful.

In the case submitted, the priest who is asked to hear the confession requires delegated jurisdiction, and as this is not one of the instances where jurisdiction is delegated by law (v.g. common error, danger of death, during a sea or an air journey) it must come from the local Ordinary.

It is possible for the local Ordinary to authorise his priests to request any visiting priest to hear their confession, and the visitor would then have jurisdiction conferred upon him. There is reason to believe that in some Dioceses of Australia such provision has been made, either by synodal statute or otherwise; but it certainly does not apply everywhere. Where the concession is available, the priests concerned would be well aware of it, and would inform the visitor that they had authority from the Ordinary to request absolution from any priest. Should it be laid down that the priest from outside the diocese must have faculties from his own Ordinary, this is merely a condition of his receiving jurisdiction from another Ordinary to hear a confession in his territory.

The Fourth Plenary Council granted to parish priests and priests in charge of a vacant parish (*vicarii oeconomi*) the faculty to give jurisdiction for confessions to a priest from outside the Diocese, provide he is of good character and enjoys the faculties of his own Diocese.[6] This would be an example of delegation by virtue of a particular law (*a iure particulari*). There is an obligation imposed of informing the Diocesan Curia within three days that this faculty has been availed of. We see no reason why a parish priest, could not request a visitor to hear his own confession, by reason of the decree of the Plenary Council, nor why he could not grant the faculty for the visitor to hear the confession of his curate. While he must subsequently notify the Curia that he has given faculties for confessions to Father X of the Diocese of N, there is no need to state for whose advantage he did so.

---

[6]Concil. Plen. dec. 408 (b).

MISSA PRO POPULO — SUNDAY OBLIGATION — EUCHARISTIC FAST — FRIDAY ABSTINENCE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. What is the obligation with regard to the *Missa pro populo* (a) of a priest who takes charge of a parish during the long illness of a Rector Irremovable, and (b) of a priest who takes charge of a parish during a prolonged vacation of the pastor, who, during his absence draws no revenue from the parish?

2. Is is permissible for the priest charged with a country district to preach that his parishioners are obliged to come ten or twelve miles by motor car, when there is no Mass at the centre where they reside?

3. What is the gravity of the sin committed by a person who habitually leaves Mass early on Sundays, mainly to miss the sermon? It seems there is a double fault: not hearing a complete Mass, and contempt for religious instruction.

4. In the circumstances where it is lawful for a priest to take liquid refreshment at least an hour before Mass, if he is some minutes (ten or twelve) within the hour advertised for Mass, may he commence Mass a corresponding number of minutes late?

5. If it came to the knowledge of a priest that a parishioner made it a practice of eating a sufficiently small quantity of meat to avoid mortal sin by parvity of matter, what must the priest do in the case?

MICHAEL.

REPLY.

1. (a) It seems that the priest who takes charge of a parish during a prolonged illness of the pastor is the *vicarius adiutor* contemplated in can. 475:

> If the parish priest, because of old age, mental debility, incompetence, or other permanent inability, is incapable of discharging his duties properly, the Ordinary shall give him an assistant vicar . . . . The vicar must be given a sufficient portion of the income of the parish for his support, unless other provision has been made for him.
>
> The vicar who takes the place of the pastor in all affairs of the parish has all the rights and duties of a parish priest, with the exception of the application of the Mass for the people, which obligation rests on the parish priest. If, however, he has only a part of the pastoral duties to attend to, his rights and duties depend on his letters of appointment.
>
> If the parish priest is of sound mind, the vicar must help him in the pastoral duties under his authority and according to the Bishop's letters.

The Canon expressly states that the obligation of the *Missa pro populo* rests with the parish priest. In case he is unable to offer it himself, it is his duty to see that some other priest does so for him. Even where the parish priest were unable, because of mental disability

or other reason, to arrange for the celebration of the Mass for the people, the vicar would still not be bound: rather would it rest with the Ordinary to see to the celebration of the Mass, assigning a stipend presumably from the income of the pastor who is unable to fulfil his duties.[7]

(b) The parish priest is bound by the law of residence, and may be absent from his parish for two months, either continuously or intermittently, during the course of one year. The Ordinary for a serious reason may permit only a shorter period of vacation or he may likewise extend it.[8] During his absence, the care of souls is entrusted to a vicar substitute,[9] who has not the obligation of the *Missa pro populo,* which rests with the parish priest, who may commit the fulfilling of the obligation to the priest who takes his place in the parish.[10]

The responsibility of the Mass for the people is the pastor's: this is true, whether he is in a position to celebrate it himself or not. But we think the law presupposes that he is in receipt of a substantial part of the revenue of his parish, sufficient, at least, for his support. If he derives no income from the parish during his extended absence, it is difficult to impose an obligation in justice on him with regard to any ministerial activity on behalf of the parishioners. The circumstances do not seem to be contemplated by the law, and we can only venture an opinion that the position is analogous to the vacancy of the parish; that the administrator would be bound to the *Missa pro populo.* This would seem equitable if the revenue of the parish were received by the administrator, and also in the case where the onus of the Mass for the people were taken into account by the Bishop when he determined the salary of the administrator. As a practical solution to a doubt, a direction could be sought from the Ordinary.

2. The obligation of hearing Mass on Sundays and Feasts of precept ceases when a proportionate difficulty stands in the way of its fulfilment. Physical impossibility will of course excuse, but any serious obstacle which makes it reasonably hard to be present at Mass will suffice, as it is equivalent to moral impossibility. With regard to distance to be travelled to a church, attempts have been made to arrive

---

[7]Coronata. *Institutiones Iuris Canonici.* n. 491. 2.

[8]For an absence notably longer than two months, one of the reasons mentioned by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, de ref. cap. 1.) would be required: *christiana caritas, urgens necessitas, debita obedientia, evidens Ecclesiae aut Reipublicae necessitas vel utilitas.* (Capello. *Summa Iuris Canonici.* vol. I., n 534).

[9]Can. 465, par. 4., Can. 474.

[10]Can. 466, par. 5.

at some definite rule; but so many variable circumstances have to be considered, v.g., the condition of the roads, the state of the weather, the health of the individual, etc., that it is unwise to be over precise. It may be gathered from St. Alphonsus[11] that a distance of a league (about three miles) or a good hour's walk would suffice to excuse from attendance at Mass, and even a shorter walk if the weather were unfavourable. If means of conveyance are available, a longer journey could be reasonably expected, varying with the means of travel and the expense involved. What would be an ordinary journey for the individuals concerned should be undertaken to fulfil the precept of hearing Mass. It seems that people who readily drive a car ten or twelve miles to cope with the usual contingencies of life, and a *fortiori* those who think nothing of such a journey for social or recreational purposes, are bound to travel the same distance by car to assist at Sunday Mass. However, the mere possession of a car does not of itself argue that it can be used without difficulty to go to Mass; and unless the priest is sure that all his congregation are well able to bear the expense and inconvenience of the weekly trip to the central church, it may be prudent not to *preach* in such definite terms. A private exhortation to those who are known to stand in need of it may be preferable, and perhaps more efficacious.

3. If the sermon is preached after the gospel, those who depart beforehand have not fulfilled their obligation, and, unless they have some real excusing cause, are guilty of grave sin on each occasion. We suspect, however, that our correspondent has in mind a place where, for some reason, the sermon is given after the Communion. The portion of the Mass omitted is not a notable part of the sacred rite, and contempt apart, persons who go away before the sermon could not be accused of serious sin. A habit of this sort does argue a lack of appreciation of sacred things and a distaste for religious instruction. The obligation to attend religious instruction would be serious only in the case of those who are ignorant of the truths and precepts of our Religion which are necessary to lead a Christian life. From experience we would think a habit of leaving Mass early and missing the sermon springs from levity and want of thought rather than deliberate contempt of holy things. The man who really despises what he is seriously bound to do by the laws of God and the Church would scarcely bother to come to Mass at all. Pastoral admonition is called for, but one must

[11]Theol. Moral. lib. II., n. 329.

be slow to judge the transgressors guilty of serious sin.

4. If the priest were to take liquid refreshment within an hour of the time advertised for the beginning of Mass, knowing he cannot delay going to the altar till an hour has passed, he would commit a serious sin, by violating the law of the Eucharistic fast. Where it is no inconvenience to the people and the occasion of no scandal to commence Mass some minutes late, he could delay till the hour has elapsed, and no harm would be done. Should he have accidently broken his fast, and the circumstances will not permit Mass to start late, we think he may proceed. The natural law of preserving public order would prevail over the ecclesiastical law of the Eucharistic fast.

5. The parishioner who makes it a practice to take a small quantity of meat each Friday could be asked the reason for his action. If he has sufficient need, the priest could, *quo confessarius* here in Australia, or perhaps *quo parochus,* dispense him from the law of abstinence. Should there be no necessity for a dispensation, he can be urged to keep the Church's law in its entirety; but as he is not guilty of serious fault, he cannot be denied absolution.

* * * *

A QUALIFIED CONTRACT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A farmer is allowed a concession on petrol to be used on his tractor. He signs a declaration that the petrol is solely for use on the land. He now puts some of it in his car for private use. Is he doing any wrong, and is he bound to restitution?

INTERESTED.

REPLY.

A declaration made without the intention of acting as was stated would be an untruth, which is always wrong. However, it seems from the wording of the query that the decision to use some of the petrol for his car was made by the farmer after the purchase at concession rates hade been made. He broke his agreement with the firm that sold the motor spirit; but whether he violated commutative justice and is bound to restitution depends on the intention which prompted the request for a declaration as to the use of the petrol.

Petrol is a commodity which is sold at a fixed price, and the vendor has a right to ask the full amount determined by regulation under the law. If he agrees to forego a portion of the price under certain guarantees, these must be sincerely given by the purchaser

who wishes to enjoy the concession. Once the transaction has been completed, the petrol passes into the ownership of the purchaser, who has bound himself, according to the conditions of the sale, to use it for the stated purposes.

The binding force of this agreement depends on the reasons which prompted the vendor to demand it. If the reduction were merely a means to boost the sale of petrol by selling it to the farmers in large quantities, with lower costs of distribution, the purchase of a sufficient amount which would justify the concession would fulfil all requirements, and the farmer could please himself as to how he used it, without sinning against justice. On the other hand, should the intention of the petrol company (or the Government, or whoever is the benefactor in the case) be to promote the national good by development of the land, there would be an obligation, attached to the contract of sale, to use the commodity for the ends stipulated and no other. This would enter into the essence of the contract and its fulfilment would be a conscientious obligation of the farmer, binding in justice.

A violation of commutative justice induces the duty of restitution. It may be questioned if the use of the farmer's car for his lawful purposes is not really 'for use on the land' and so within the terms of the agreement. If this be not true, the amount involved would be the difference between the fixed price of petrol and the price actually paid—probably a few pence per gallon. It will be seen that a considerable mileage would have to be done on concession petrol, before the obligation of restitution would be serious. The enjoyment of these small concessions would be spread over a lengthy period, and could be considered much as petty thefts, which would take a long time to coalesce into grave matter. Finally, the benefactor, knowing human nature, would not be surprised or reasonably unwilling that a small proportion of the petrol purchased for a tractor would find its way into the tank of the farmer's car. The farmer should honour his declaration: if the use of concession petrol for his car is altogether excluded, he should abide by what he agreed to do. The obligation would be at least from fidelity to an equivalent promise, perhaps from justice. Our correspondent, who has more information of the case would know. The amount of restitution, where justice is violated, would not be usually very great, and a reasonable cause would excuse from it.

FIRST COMMUNION OF CHILDREN OF CARELESS PARENTS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Among children attending the parochial school are several whose parents rarely attend Mass, and the children do not attend either. The time for first Communion is drawing close and these children are in the first Communion class. Hence the problem: may they be allowed to make their first Confession and Communion? There seems little likelihood that their Mass attendance will improve.

2. At the Public School there are somewhat older children (11-13 years) who have not yet made their first Communion or been to Confession. These children, following the example of their parents, rarely, if ever, go to Mass. May they be admitted to the Sacraments without showing some signs of improvement, say by regular attendance at Mass for a month?

PRAEOCCUPATUS.

REPLY.

Children attending the parochial school, who have reached the age of discretion, should be admitted to their first Communion. The fear that their home environment will lead to future carelessness, as it has been responsible for past and present neglect, is not a reason to exclude them from the reception of Penance or the Holy Eucharist. The prospects of older children at the public schools are less bright, but their past history is not sufficient proof of indisposition to deny them the Sacraments. A delay may be justified, if necessary to complete the required instruction, but we doubt if it can be demanded as a proof of sincerity.

1. Reception of first Holy Communion is a public act of religion, and to prevent a child from taking part in it is a serious matter. Every baptised person may and should be admitted to Communion, unless he is forbidden by law. The persons forbidden by law are mentioned in cann. 854-858. In the first place are children, who by reason of their immaturity, have not as yet a knowledge and a desire of the Sacrament. The members of the first Communion class are being given the instruction to enable them to have this knowledge and a desire to be united to our Lord in the holy Eucharist. Next come public sinners, such as excommunicated persons, those under interdict or openly living in sin, unless it is certain they have done penance, mended their ways and repaired any public scandal they may have given. These are

to be refused Communion, even publicly, while sinners whose crimes are not generally known, are to be refused if they request It privately, but not if they approach publicly, and cannot be passed by without scandal. Then, there are those conscious of mortal sin, who must not receive Communion till they have first been to Confession, unless in case of necessity, when the state of grace regained by an act of perfect contrition will suffice. Reception of Holy Communion more than once a day is forbidden, except in danger of death or to preserve the sacred Species from irreverence. Finally, the non-observance of the prescribed fast is an obstacle to Communion.

Children in the first Communion class at a parochial school are not public sinners. It may be well doubted if they are capable of the malice sufficient for certain mortal sin, and even if they had so transgressed, it is a matter for the internal forum of Penance. They are to be treated according to the prescriptions of the decree of the S. Congregation of Sacraments *Quam singulari* (8th August, 1910) ever associated the memory of Pope St. Pius X, which have been incorporated into can. 854 of the Code. They must have a knowledge befitting their years of the mysteries of our Faith, which are to be accepted *necessitate medii.* Besides belief in one God, Who will reward the good and punish the wicked, these are, for practical purposes, the mysteries of the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation and the Redemption. First communicants should be able to distinguish the Blessed Eucharist from common bread, and approach it with the reverence to be expected at their tender age. The religious teachers in the school will labour that this knowledge is acquired, and the parish priest may assure himself on the point, if needs be, by examination. The matter of the fast is not beyond the capacity of the children, and the other prohibitions do not apply.

The fact that they come from careless homes has placed these children at a disadvantage, with regard to their knowledge of religion, since they lack the good example which is more efficacious than mere instruction; but they are not thereby incapable of fulfilling what is required for admission to Holy Communion. There can be no question, then, of excluding them because of their past or present qualifications. The doubt seems to be raised concerning the future. Are the children to be refused Communion, because it is foreseen, with a fair degree of probability, that they will continue to follow the bad example of their parents and be remiss in attendance at Sunday Mass? The blame must

be laid on the parents, and surely the children should not be asked to suffer for it by being deprived of the graces which may help them to lead Catholic lives. Whatever chance they have can be increased by helping them to receive the Sacraments; and the desire for frequent Communion may well be a motive for more regular attendance at Mass. Further, it is not the parents who are being prepared for Communion, but the children; and the children's present dispositions are the matter for decision. No one can doubt that they have all the good resolutions, here and now, to fit them for the graces of the Sacrament of Penance and a worthy reception of Communion. They may, in after years, become culpably careless, and they may continue now to be careless with whatever guilt can be attached to childish acts or omissions, but they do not come under any heading of those forbidden by law to receive the Eucharist. The fear or probability of future sin is not incompatible with present determination to avoid offending God. Likewise, the chances of lapse from the obligatory practices of a Catholic life do not necessarily preclude the good dispositions at the moment. The children referred to in the first section of the query are disposed for the Sacraments; they request them, at least through their teachers with the approval of their parents, and we do not see how they can be refused.

2. The children in the higher age group, who attend the public schools, are in a worse condition as regards instruction and they are without the help and reminders constantly given to their charges by religious teachers. As they are more developed, a better understanding of the Christian doctrine may be expected of them. However, they are still young and depend on their guardians for direction and decision, even in spiritual affairs. Their neglect in the past was not their fault; they deserve sympathy rather than blame. Will they be any better after they have made their first Communion? We can hope only for an improvement, for certainly they will be no worse. If they were refused the Sacraments, the day may never dawn when they will ask for them again. This is not an argument, we know, for giving the holy Things to those who will desecrate them; but it presupposes that the present dispositions of the children are good. The question of subjective guilt must be left to the judgment of the confessor; and it may be asked whether he would not be bound to give them absolution. With so many difficulties at home, it is hard to say that the child is guilty of serious sin when he does not prepare himself and go off

alone to Mass on Sunday morning. At any rate, he is not obstinate in sin, and promises to be faithful in the future.

As remarked above, exclusion from first Communion is exclusion from a public act of religion, and presumes the public unworthiness of subject. If children under the age of puberty are exempt from ecclesiastical penalties because they lack the necessary power of deliberation, it is a fair conclusion that it would be against the mind of the Church to deprive them of spiritual benefits because of their non-observance in the past of the Sunday precept. They are not public sinners and cannot be publicly refused the exercise of their right to receive Communion, which they have from their Baptism.

A short delay may be called for, if failure to respond to instruction can reasonably be taken as a want of sufficient knowledge, but it is not the proper penalty for failure to attend Mass. Further, one must be careful not to single out individuals for delay, unless the idea of punishment is clearly excluded.

JAMES MADDEN.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE

LISTEN, SISTER, by John E. Moffatt, S.J. (Cork: Mercier Press. 1955. 210 pp. 10/6 stg.).

First Thought (on seeing title and glancing at random pages): How will Sister like to have her veil tweaked—not once, but a hundred times?

Second Thought (on reading first chapter): This is beautiful. Fr. Moffatt means that Sister is to listen to God. Of course.

Third Thought (on scanning other chapters): No. Sister's veil *is* being tweaked with an "I-say-there" or its trans-Pacific equivalent. She will not be able to endure this.

Fourth Thought (growing from strength to strength until the end): Sister is going to find this book sympathetic and helpful; she will probably accept even the title, gracefully.

It is a book written for American nuns, but Australians will enjoy it while drawing profit from its wise lessons—all so practical. An American reviewer complains that the chapters are too short. We, on the contrary, feel that this sort of homiletic writing should be cut into short lengths. The point is made and there is no time left for fumbling. Sister may read it as she runs.

As a book for spiritual reading done in private, it should be a favourite with Sisters who still have their high ideals, but are dissatisfied with the general tenor of their lives. Perhaps it will be even more useful to those who are tempted to give up the battle for supernatural values. The author, an experienced Retreat-master, deplores the "superficial spirit, so prevalent in the world." He dreads that "it may find its way into religious life. Indeed," he continues, "there is evidence that, in some degree at least, it has already found entrance."

If this danger is imminent in American Catholic life, Sisterhoods in Australia may well put up their ramparts, as it is certain that their vitality, too, is menaced. And anything less than the highest is too little to put before the fresh young lives that are offering themselves to God in Australian novitiates, hoping to find in religious life: charity, silence and sacrifice.

M.O.

Canon Law

Dear Rev. Sir,

I should be grateful for your views regarding the interpretation of Canon 637, which deals with the calling of religious to final profession. The Canon says that sickness which supervenes after temporary profession is not a reason for declining to call a religious to final profession, unless it were fraudulently concealed before temporary profession. Sickness such as tuberculosis or cancer creates no difficulty, for if these are contracted after temporary profession the religious must be called to final vows. But what about a mental ailment? Take, for example, the case of a religious who suffers a nervous breakdown through overwork or for some other reason. If the breakdown is permanent and the religious has to be cared for in a mental home, there is no difficulty, for Rome has stated that such a person must be cared for by the institute and remains indefinitely a religious with temporary vows. But what about the religious who recovers and whose vows consequently expire? Can the institute decline to call such a person to final vows simply on the ground that, having suffered a nervous breakdown, this person is clearly not suited to the religious life?

SACERDOS.

REPLY.

Although our correspondent begins by saying that he would be grateful for our views regarding the interpretation of Canon 637, it becomes clear from his subsequent remarks that he is inquiring, not about the interpretation of the Canon in general, but about a particular aspect or application of it. That is, he is concerned in particular with the religious who has recovered from a nervous breakdown incurred during the period of temporary profession and whose temporary vows have now expired; and he desires to know whether the religious institute must, in virtue of Canon 637, call this religious to final profession, or whether the institute can decline to do so on the ground that the religious, having suffered a nervous breakdown, is not suited to the religious life; that is, not on the ground of infirmity but on the ground of unsuitability.

However, some general remarks about Canon 637 will be helpful in clearing the way for the answer to the proposed query. After stating that religious, at the expiration of temporary vows, is juridically

free to leave the religious institute, Canon 637 proceeds to state that, provided justifying reasons exist, the institute may refuse permission to such a religious either to renew temporary profession or to be admitted to perpetual profession. However—and this is the important point as far as our proposed query is concerned—the canon explicitly excludes ill-health from these justifying reasons unless it can definitely be established that the religious had fraudulently concealed or dissimulated his or her state of health before making temporary profession. Our correspondent restricts his case, and therefore our present scope, to a supervening mental derangement from which a religious in temporary vows recovers, and whose vows then expire.

In the first place, the matter of the status of a religious in temporary vows who suffers a mental derangement has already formed the subject of a special decree of the Sacred Congregation of Religious given on 5th February, 1925. This is the reply referred to by our correspondent. This decision asserted that a religious who was thus afflicted during the period of temporary profession and remains in that condition cannot be rejected by the institute, and that the status of such a member remains that of a religious with temporary vows. Thus Creusen writes: "A religious who becomes afflicted with mental derangement during the period of his temporary vows *must be kept* in the religious institute. Such a person continues to be a part of the institute in the condition or state in which he was at the moment the malady manifested itself, and the institute retains in his regard the same obligations which it had before." (Creusen, J., Religious Men and Women in the Code, 5th English Ed., Milwaukee, 1953, p. 238, n. 2).

But what is the position if the religious recovers from the mental illness? It is clear from Canon 637 that the religious institute may not refuse permission to such a religious to renew temporary profession or make final profession on the sole ground of ill-health as such, since in the case the illness would have originated after the taking of temporary vows and thus could not have been fraudulently concealed. In other words, the only circumstance under which ill-health can be a ground for exclusion from renewal of temporary profession or making of final profession is not verified in the proposed case. Consequently, the religious cannot be refused admission to final profession on the ground of this temporary mental derangement considered as an illness that had intervened after the making of temporary profession.

However, our correspondent is endeavouring to contemplate the

case as one in which the religious is not to be refused admission to final profession on the ground of the temporary illness as such, but on the ground that as a result of that illness the religious may now be considered as unsuitable to the religious life; that is, not on the ground of ill-health, but on the ground of unsuitability.

It is true that at the expiration of temporary profession a prudent judgment that a candidate is unsuited to the religious life would constitute a sufficient reason for not admitting that person to final profession. But that judgment would be based on such grounds as incompatibility, serious doubt about a person's religious spirit, serious doubt about the intellectual or moral fitness of a person, and the like. It might have been possible to make out a case for a similar rejection on the ground that the temporary nervous breakdown would make a person unsuited for religious life if infirmity had not been expressly mentioned as an exception in Canon 637. But infirmity is expressly mentioned in that canon, and we fail to see how the proposed ground of refusal to admit to final profession can escape inclusion under this heading. It appears to us that, whether one proposes to reject the religious on the ground of the temporary breakdown as such or on the ground of unsuitability based on the temporary breakdown, the religious in fact would be refused admission to final profession on the ground of infirmity; for even in the latter hypothesis the religious is surely being rejected in fact on the ground of ill-health which was not—and in the proposed case could not possibly have been—fraudulently concealed before profession. The unsuitability in the case is really and fundamentally the state of health of the religious.

Undoubtedly, too, there would be present in such a motive for rejection the fear of future relapse. Consequently, it seems to us that whether the case is looked at from the point-of-view of the past, the present, or the future, the ultimate ground of the rejection would be the state of health of the religious; and, therefore, that the proposed suggestion of our correspondent would be a vain effort to escape a very strict provision of law, by which the legislator wishes to avoid infirmity ever being used as a reason for rejecting a person who has already taken at least temporary vows. And, after all, may it not also be urged that, if a temporary professed religious who has not recovered from a mental derangement cannot be rejected, there would appear to be greater reason for not rejecting one who has recovered. At the most the superiors may endeavour to persuade such a religious to leave

the institute on the ground suggested by our correspondent; but we believe that to try to impose this rejection on such a religious would be a violation of the ruling of Canon 637.

* * * *

DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE IN FAVOREM FIDEI

The purpose of the following remarks is to supplement the discussion concerning the dissolution of marriage *in favorem fidei* which is to be found in this year's January issue of the A.C.R. In the reply to the query proposed in the January issue it was pointed out that the Church has power to dissolve *in favorem fidei,* and has actually so dissolved, marriages contracted between two non-catholics of whom one has not been baptised, and also marriages between a Catholic and an unbaptised non-catholic contracted in the Church with a dispensation from the impediment of Disparity of Cult, even though these marriages have been consummated. It was also pointed out that in the latter type of case dispensations have been granted only in very recent years, so that in fact in many text-books there is as yet no reference to them.

The particular cases discussed in that article were examples of this latter type of dispensation, and the favour of the dispensation was granted, *not to the Catholic party, but to the unbaptised party to the marriage,* on condition of the conversion of that party and the desire to marry a Catholic. Hence, in the conclusion to the article we wrote: "A valid marriage between an unbaptised person and a baptised person, whether Catholic or non-catholic, is intrinsically indissoluble in that it cannot be dissolved by the parties themselves. However, such marriages do not possess an absolute extrinsic indissolubility, and hence they may be dissolved by the Roman Pontiff provided certain conditions are verified . . . . If these conditions are fulfilled the favour of the dissolution of the natural bond of marriage can be granted *to the non-catholic party* who becomes a Catholic and wishes to marry a Catholic. So far the dispensation has rarely been granted in the case where the marriage has been contracted with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult, and it remains to be seen whether there will be any notable mitigation of the Church's attitude."

It has now come to our notice that another mitigation of the Church's attitude in this matter has taken place. It is exemplified in a case presented to the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office from the diocese of Monterey-Fresno, the same diocese that was concerned with the cases treated of in the previous article. The following account

of the relevant details of the case will bring out clearly the nature of the mitigation of the Church's discipline concerning this type of matrimonial dispensation.

The case concerned a marriage between a Catholic man and a non-baptised woman which, having been attempted outside the Church. was then revalidated in the Church after the proper dispensation from the impediment of Disparity of Cult had been obtained. The unbaptised wife subsequently left the Catholic man, and a civil divorce was obtained. The Catholic man then wished to contract marriage with a non-catholic woman who, however, was receiving instructions in order to be received into the Church. Hence, a petition for the favour of the dissolution *in favorem fidei* of the previous "unsacramental" marriage was submitted to the Holy Office. The principal reasons adduced in support of the petition were the following: "(1) In favour of the faith of the petitioner, . . . that is, in the preservation of his faith; (2) In favour of the faith of the woman he wishes to marry, who, though now a non-Catholic, is taking a course of instructions to be baptised and enter the Church; (3) In favour of the faith of any and all children born of this union—that is, to make sure in as far as is humanly possible, the baptism and Catholic education of the children . . ." (Cfr. Bouscaren, Canon Law Digest, Annual Supplement for 1954, under Canon 1127).

The outcome was that the Holy Office made recommendation to the Holy Father "in favour of the dissolution of the above marriage in favour of the faith, so that the petitioner can validly and licitly contract a new marriage before the Church, with a Catholic woman." (Cfr. Bouscaren, loc. cit.). In the audience granted on 23rd January, 1955, the Holy Father granted the petition.

Consequently, in this matter of the dissolution of marriage *in favorem fidei* another extension has been granted by the Church: the dissolution *in favorem fidei* of the natural bond of marriage contracted in the Church between a Catholic and an unbaptised non-Catholic, and *granted in favour of the party who was already a Catholic,* in order to contract marriage with another Catholic. It should be kept in mind, however, that, although we have used the phrase 'another extension', there is no intrinsic difference between this dissolution and the previous types of dissolution *in favorem fidei.* They are all equally natural bonds of marriage which do not possess an absolute extrinsic indissolubility

and, provided the requisite conditions for the exercise of the papal authortiy are verified, may be dissolved.

Therefore, in regard to the dissolution of marriage *in favorem fidei,* even though consumated, three stages of development may be distinguished: (1) The dissolution of the natural bond of marriage between two non-Catholics, the one baptised and the other unbaptised, and granted to either one upon their conversion to marry a Catholic; (2) The dissolution of the natural bond of marriage between a Catholic and an unbaptised non-Catholic, contracted in the Catholic Church with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult, and granted to the non-Catholic upon conversion to marry a Catholic; (3) The dissolution of the natural bond of marriage between a Catholic and an unbaptised non-Catholic, contracted in the Catholic Church with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult, and granted to the Catholic party in order to marry another Catholic.

G. C. GALLEN.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE

"OF HIS FULLNESS: A CHRISTIAN REVIEW." by Gerald Vann, O.P., London, Burns and Oates. First published 1939. This Edition 1954. 160 pages. Price: 13/9.

Father Vann has given us a general view of some of the main aspects of the spiritual life. Among the 24 chapters are chapters on each of the seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, on Pride, Perseverance Poverty, The Mystical Body, Prayers, Envy and Jealousy: Family Life, The Kingship of Christ, and Our Lady. The contents were given originally as a retreat for religious, but have since been revised and are now addressed primarily to people living in the world, to provide them with a unified view of the spiritual life and to show how it can be lived in these confused times. Fr. Vann gives much good, practical advice. Yet besides writing as a spiritual author, he also does so as a philosopher. He writes with depth. St. Thomas is frequently quoted. The book should be enjoyed by those who like their spiritual reading logically set out, with ideas clearly divided and following one another in their right order. The style is very compact; Fr. Vann writes vigorously, packing a wealth of meaning into all he says. The educated Catholic will find much in the work to reflect on.

G.C.

Liturgy

PREACHING BEFORE THE BLESSED SACRAMENT EXPOSED

Dear Rev. Father,

May I call attention to the fact that the Answer of the S.R.C. (3728 in 2) is not a *general* Decree or decision requiring the veiling of the Blessed Sacrament while a sermon is preached during an exposition, as you seem to conclude in the A.C.R., April, 1956, page 161.

N.3728 in 2 (S.R.C., 10th May, 1890) is a *particular* answer about a *particular custom* in Monte Reale, Sicily, (Archdiocese), viz.: the custom of:

(a) *exposing* the Blessed Sacrament

(b) of *celebrating* Mass before It, on the occasion of a Novena

(c) after the Gospel, the preaching of the Word of God, *and for the most part (chiefly) about the Saints.*

The ceremonies—so loved and made much of by the Sicilians—are for the most part held on the *occasion* of their national days—feasts of their Patron Saints.

There is no precise question (in the Query of N.3728 in 2) of a sermon about the Blessed Sacrament in the circumstances; but rather of the 'praedicatio Verbi et *plerumque de Sanctis'*, these words showing the key point of the query being the preaching about the Saints they were honouring in the celebrations.

That it is not a general decision or decree of the S.R.C. requiring the veiling of the Blessed Sacrament exposed, during a sermon *on the Blessed Sacrament* is so understood by the liturgist writing in the *"Homiletic and Pastoral Review,"* U.S.A., March, 1953, page 567:— "If the central theme of the sermon is the Blessed Sacrament, the monstrance may remain unveiled, provided that the sermon be not unduly prolonged (I.E.R., June, 1952)." "This is a good thing to know if one conducts the Holy Hour, for instance, by giving a number of little talks on the Blessed Sacrament, with prayers in between."

When we turn to the reference in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (quoted above in the Homiletic and Pastoral Review) of June, 1952, page 460, we read:— "If the monstrance is to remain unveiled during the sermon, the central theme must be the Blessed Sacrament, and the sermon must not be a prolonged one." Further references were given

in that June, 1952, I.E.R. to that discussion in former numbers, viz., I.E.R., 1937, pp. 432-3, and 503-5, also 1944, pp. 60-1, in which the Irish liturgist discussed the local customs (in Sicily) and showed some provision for reverence could be called for in such circumstances as the Query to the S.R.C. 3728 in 2.

But we may ask why a condition was mentioned in the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* 1953, p. 567, viz., "provided the sermon be not unduly prolonged," quoting the I.E.R., June, 1952, p. 460: "and the sermon must not be a prolonged one." We may ask when would a sermon be considered, and by whom, "unduly prolonged" or "not a prolonged one"?

Further, in the A.C.R., April, 1956, p. 161, we may question the meaning of the phrases: (a) (1st paragraph) "A sermon, even on the Blessed Eucharist, must necessarily withdraw the attention of the congregation *from* the Blessed Sacrament, as least temporarily."

(b) (2nd paragraph) "Keeping in mind the above principle, the priest conducting the Holy Hour should prepare his words in the form of a *meditation,* directing them to the Blessed Sacrament, and focusing the thoughts of the congregation *on the Blessed Sacrament,* not on the contents of his words." May we ask: Is not a sermon meant to be meditative, "directing" and "focusing the thoughts of the congregation" on the theme of his sermon, "not on the contents of his words"?

May I also call attention to the particular phrase of 3728 in 2, viz., "et plerumque de Sanctis." To translate "plerumque" as 'sometimes' as we find in the A.C.R., July, 1929, page 261, is inaccurate in view of the text and the context of the Query and Answer of 3728 in 2. The usual meaning of plerumque is 'for the most part' or 'chiefly'.

Is it not a pity that Wuest-Mullaney, in *"Matters Liturgical,"* 1947, p. 229, n. 376, and J. O'Connell in *"The Celebration of Mass,"* Vol. III, 1942, p. 197 in 17, merely cite 3728 in 2 as if a general decision without, seemingly, having examined in detail the Answer and Query in S.R.C. Fortescue-O'Connell, in *"The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described,"* 1943, p. 240, merely state: "Sermons may be preached, but only on the subject of the Blessed Eucharist. During a sermon a veil must be placed before the Blessed Sacrament" without citation of any decision of the S.R.C., even of 3728 in 2.

Surely, if the S.R.C. had intended to give a general direction concerning all sermons before the Blessed Sacrament Exposed, it would

have done so ere this! The words "et plerumque de Sanctis" would not have been so important!

INTERESTED.

REPLY

The objections raised by our correspondent seem rather formidable. The matter, too, has practical and frequent application to the Forty Hours' Prayer and the devotion of the Holy Hour, consequently a longer treatment may be justified.

The discussion centres around the interpretation of Decree 3728, 2, of the Congregation of Rites.

MONTIS REGALIS

DUBIUM II. Num tolerari possit consuetudo exponendi SSmum Sacramentum, et coram eo Missam celebrandi (occasione Novemdialis in qua fit post Evangelium praedicatio Verbi Dei et plerumque de Sanctis; et in qua populus frequens accedit ad Sacram Synaxim?

R. Ad II. Affirmative; apposito tamen velamine ante Sanctissimam Eucharistiam, dum habetur concio.

The translation proposed by our correspondent is correct.

Is this a particular decision applicable only to the special form of devotions described in the question? *Particular* decrees of the Congregation of Rites are those which are addressed to a particular person (physical or moral) and are concerned with a particular matter. Such decrees usually indicate the person or place from which the question originated, e.g., 3728 came from Monreale, Sicily. On the other hand, other decrees of the Congregation are described as *formally general,* and are intended for the whole Church, e.g., the decree introducing the Restored Order of Holy Week carried the title Decretum generale. A third division of decrees consists of *equivalently general* decrees. To this third group belong those decrees which are particular decrees in form, in as much as they carry the name of the person by whom they were proposed, but they are said to be equivalently general because they deal with some matter of general concern to the Church, in so far as they interpret or apply a general law of the liturgy or a general rubric. This threefold distinction is of paramount importance in determining the binding force of a decree (cfr. Oppenheim, *Institutiones in sacram liturgiam,* III, 52-55; McManus, *The Congregation of Sacred Rites,* 131-134).

Our problem may seemingly be reduced to two questions: (i) Is Decree 3728 a particular decision having the force of law only in the Archdiocese of Monreale, or is it an equivalently general decree which is applicable to Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament even outside the territorial limits of Monreale? (ii) What is the meaning of the reply given in Decree 3728; is it concerned with all sermons preached during Exposition or only with those whose subject matter is not the Blessed Eucharist?

The Decree under discussion is, we think, an equivalently general decree. While the reply was given for a particular set of circumstances it does lay down a norm of procedure for a form of devotion which is commonly observed throughout the Church. Despite the difference in terminology, it would seem that our correspondent might be willing to admit this conclusion and to agree that if the sermon is not about the Blessed Eucharist the monstrance should be veiled. The constant reference to this decree by rubricians, irrespective of their interpretation, confirms this opinion.

Turning now to the interpretation of the decree. We must endeavour to determine whether the decree requires the veiling of the Blessed Sacrament during *any* sermon or merely during those sermons which are preached on a subject other than the Blessed Sacrament. It may help to recall one or two points of legislation in existence before Decree 3728 was given in 1890.

The Clementine Instruction for the Forty Hours' Prayer, published in its present form in 1731 by Pope Clement XII, strictly forbids preaching during the Prayer, but allows, with written permission, a short sermon (breve sermone) after Vespers; this sermon must be delivered from a position near the altar of Exposition (§ xxxii). This prohibition applies only in Rome and during the Forty Hours' Prayer. There is no general law forbidding preaching during Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. Commenting on this paragraph of the Instruction, Gardellini (+ 1829) describes the short sermon which may be allowed as 'breve colloquium' and 'breve aliquod soliloquium' and he suggests that it might be given by the priest kneeling on the altar step on the gospel side. He observes that this posture will cause no great inconvenience, since the sermon must be brief (*Commentaria* IV, 122-123). The subject matter of this sermon must be the Blessed Eucharist, and there is no suggestion that the monstrance should be veiled. On the contrary, the Blessed Sacrament must not be veiled during the Forty

Hours' Prayer, and this is a further reason why sermons are disallowed according to Roman usage (ibid., p. 121). This same commentator frequently mentions the practice of preaching even on subjects other than the Blessed Eucharist, during Exposition but he does not explicitly say that the monstrance must be veiled. If the monstrance is veiled, the subject of the sermon is not restricted to the Eucharist and the people may sit down, 'sed nullatenus sedere populo permittendum esset, si conciones haberentur coran Sacramento nullo velamine tecto' (ibid., 121). In the absence of any precise statement on the point, the opinion of Gardellini seems to be that the Blessed Sacrament should be veiled during a sermon, except for a short sermon on the Eucharist.

In 1883 the Congregation of Rites replied to a query about the lawfulness of a *fervorino* in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed on the altar. In the church of St. Nicholas in Naples special devotions were held on each Friday in honour of the Precious Blood. The devotions centred around an image of the *Ecce Homo* before which Mass was celebrated, the Blessed Sacrament exposed and Benediction given. The Congregation was asked if was permissible to have during the Exposition a short sermon (conciuncula vulgo *Fervorino*). The reply was: Affirmative (3599, 2). No veil is required, the sermon is a short exhortation and presumably on a subject, the Precious Blood, which is liturgically an identical mystery with the Blessed Eucharist.

The reply contained in Decree 3728 was given in 1890. A sermon, generally about some Saint, is preached during Mass celebrated in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed, but the monstrance must be veiled. Does the Congregation require the monstrance to be veiled during such sermons because their subject matter is not the Blessed Sacrament, or because respect for the Blessed Sacrament demands that It be veiled during a sermon? Our correspondent proposes the first interpretation, but the second interpretation enjoys the support of the greater number of commentators and seems to be preferable.

It is important to note that it is a question of a formal sermon, not a brief sermon, or *fervorino,* or breve colloquium or breve soliloquium. This distinction is found in the Clementine Instruction and implied in Decree 3599. Furthermore, the majority of commentators adopt the distinction. Naturally, ideas of brevity tend to vary from person to person, but in the light of Gardellini's observation mentioned above, that the preacher should kneel at the side of the altar, one might suggest nothing more than ten minutes could be called brief. The

element of time is not the only consideration. The *fervorino,* colloquium or soliloquium signifies a peculiar type of sermon of which the immediate aim is to arouse in the minds of the congregation acts of faith, adoration, love, thanksgiving, etc. Such a short exhortation is surely quite different from a sermon on the Mass or the Real Presence, and it is this difference which we had hoped to convey to our readers in the reply of the previous issue of the A.C.R. However clumsily the idea may have been expressed, there does seem to be a sound basis for the distinction. On the score of what might be called the intrinsic argument, there is good reason to maintain that the Congregation required the veiling of the monstrance in Decree 3728 not merely because the subject matter of the sermon was not always the Blessed Eucharist, but also because it was question of a sermon and not a *fervorino* or colloquium breve.

The argument from the common teaching of commentators is convincingly in favour of this interpretation of the reply. The Roman periodical *Ephemerides liturgicae,* while not enjoying any official character but no mean authority in matters of rubrics, has frequently touched upon the matter of Decree 3728 and applied it to all sermons. The following are some references:

In 1904, p. 212, in commenting on the Clementine Instruction, Menghini states that sermons are allowed outside of Rome, but during the sermon the Blessed Sacrament must be veiled; and the sermon must be preached on the Blessed Eucharist. He refers to Decree 3728, 2.

In 1909, p. 290, the same reply of the Congregation is mentioned and the writer concludes that the monstrance must always be veiled during a sermon. One reason adduced is the fact that the Congregation made no distinction in the reply, although the query contained the words plerumque de Sanctis. A short *Fervorino* may be given without using the veil.

In 1913, p. 171, a correspondent suggested that the above replies would not be applicable in circumstances in which there would be no irreverence on the part of the congregation, who could remain facing the altar of Exposition, and when the sermon was preached on the Blessed Sacrament. The reply was the same, unless the sermon is a simple *fervorino* (simplex *fervorino*) as contemplated in Decree 3599 (cfr. above), the veil must be used in accord with Decree 3728.

Lastly, in 1930, p. 227, one of the norms to be observed during

Exposition is: 'quod non fiant sermones, iis exceptis, ubi indultum est, qui adorationem foveant: quo in casu, sint breves et fervore pleni: ante Sanctissimum extendatur velum sericum'. Reference is made to Decree 3728.

In full accord with the above opinion is that expressed in *L' Ami du clergé,* 1947, pp. 827-828. The writer refers to the Decree and observes that it does not make any distinction about the subject matter of the sermon. He mentions also a private reply to the diocese of La Rochelle in 1849, in which the use of the veil was described as a universal practice.

As to the opinions proposed in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* it is true that Dr. Long did admit that Decree 3728 could be so interpreted 'as not forbidding a sermon expressly on the Holy Eucharist when the circumstances are such as to render unlikely any irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament. The most reverent form which the sermon could take would be that of a meditation on the Holy Eucharist. The preacher could avoid turning his back on the monstrance and the people could be instructed to direct their attention to the Blessed Sacrament exposed before them . . .' (May, 1937, p. 504). In the previous issue (April, pp. 432-433) it had been stated that a *fervorino* was quite in order. Unfortunately, the 1944 issue of the *I.E.R.* is not available, but Dr. Montague (*I.E.R.,* June, 1952, p. 460) says 'The custom of preaching short sermons during exposition is quite lawful . . . The purpose of such *fervorinos* must always be to direct the devotion of the faithful to the Blessed Sacrament, . . . If the monstrance is to remain unveiled during the sermon the central theme must be the Blessed Sacrament and the sermon must not be a prolonged one'. All of this is in full agreement with the opinion constantly proposed by the writers in the *Ephemerides liturgicae,* and the use of the phrase: 'the sermon must not be a prolonged one', the validity of which our correspondent questions, is fully justified as the 'short sermon' is the same as a *fervorino.* This reference does not imply an acceptance of the interpretation admitted by Dr. Long in 1937.

The correspondent of *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (March, 1953, 567) simply repeats the article of Dr. Montague without any further discussion.

Father O'Connell (*The Celebration of Mass,* vol. iii, p. 197) in the edition published in 1945, does more than merely cite Decree 3728, he also adds a reference to the *Ephemerides liturgicae,* 1913, p. 171 (quoted above) and 1922, p. 445, which 'suggests that if only a short

sermon (*fervorino*) on the Blessed Sacrament is preached the Sacred Host need not be veiled (cf. S.R.C. 3599, 2).' *Matters Liturgical,* 1956, now re-arranged and enlarged by Fr. W. T. Barry, C.SS.R., remains of the same mind (§ 414, h): 'Unless forbidden by particular law, a sermon may be preached while the Blessed Sacrament is exposed; but . . . the monstrance or ciborium must be hidden from the view of the faithful by a veil or a banneret unless there is question merely of a short fervorino on the Blessed Sacrament (S.R.C. 2769, ii: 3599, ii; 3728; Instr. Clem.: xxxii).'

As a final reference we might add Wapelhorst-Bruegge, *Compendium sacrae Liturgiae,* edit. 12a, 1945, who state that during a sermon the Blessed Sacrament must be veiled, and they understand the sermon being preached on the Blessed Eucharist during the Forty Hours' Prayer. They refer to D. 3728, 2 (§ 200).

In conclusion, it must be admitted that commentators are almost unanimous in their opinion that Decree 3728, 2 requires the veiling of the monstrance during a sermon preached in the course of Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. Bearing in mind the distinction between a *fervorino* (D. 3599, 2) and a sermon (D. 3728, 2), it is difficult to see how the interpretation proposed by INTERESTED, which would not require the use of the veil if the subject matter of the sermon is the Blessed Eucharist, may be said to have any probability. The Roman commentators cited above would surely be conversant with the circumstances of the special devotions envisaged in Decree 3728, and yet they reject the proposed distinction. In view of such unanimity among commentators there is no need for a general direction from the Congregation of Rites, as an equivalently general decree already exists, viz. 3728, 2. Apart from a short meditation, exhortation or *fervorino*, the Blessed Sacrament exposed on the altar must be veiled during a sermon even when the sermon is preached on the Eucharist.

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

CHARITY IN ACTION

This seems to be a fairly good title for the passage of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, which is to be the subject of the following simple exposition (Rom. XII, 9-21). Charity stands at the head of it, but it is composed of a miscellaneous collection of precepts, in which it is difficult to find close logical connections and clear division. We have been tempted to adopt some title like "Charity and its Cortege" or "Charity and its Concomitants," or "Charity in Multiple Array." Really, charity dominates what St. Paul has to say in this paragraph of his great Epistle, and in that sense the whole can be brought under the heading "Charity in Action."

It would be unfair to St. Paul to say that there is no order in this piece, which he throws down with obvious neglect of all orthodox rules of syntax. The Apostle of the Gentiles does not write with his eye on the "Organon" of Aristotle nor on the Manuals of Greek Rhetoric. But there is the deep order of a glowing mind, of the mind of a man who knew thoroughly what he was talking about. The sequences are not always logical, but they are always dictated by the natural working of an active and lively mind, which sometimes moves along the road of simple verbal associations.

The syntax itself, which seems so uncommon or so unruly, may be a clue to a reasonable division. The precepts—over a dozen in a row—are formulated by means of Greek participles, infinitives, and imperatives. A series of imperatives would be the normal syntax. Actually there are only six such imperatives (one of these a doublet) in the piece, whereas there are over fifteen participles with imperative force, and two infinitives also used imperatively.

As the first three formal imperatives stand in one and the same parenthetic sentence and, as the fourth imperative (v. 16 c): "Do not be (complacently) wise in yourselves" marks a passing from positive to negative precepts, we distinguish two main divisions in the paragraph (9-16b and 16c-21), which we are about to explain.

Within the first section, in a compass of some seventy words, there are no less than twenty briefly worded precepts. The very ingenious division and connections of those precepts given by St. Thomas in his commentary on Romans are a delight to read, both

for their acuteness and for the wealth of biblical parallels he supplies. We prefer, however, in the present brief treatment of the passage, to keep to a division which is less logical. A homily is not the place for the admirable keenness of St. Thomas' dividing and subdividing mind. The Prince of Theologians is indeed one of the very greatest of Catholic commentators on St. Paul's Epistles. His work in this field is the work of a powerful and a powerfully penetrating mind; but a homilist will not follow his method except in broad outline.

The Apostle begins with that charity which is the love of neighbour. After insisting on its basic quality of sincerity, he gives two pairs of precepts in regard to it—all of them in positive participial wording.

The basic point is that charity must be unfeigned, strained free of all the showing or acting which is only a mask thrown over insincerity, and is simply called hypocrisy. Mere ceremonial charity, charity of formal etiquette is not Christian charity. It is not a matter of acting a part, but a matter of having one's heart well-affected within. It does not consist in words or appearances only, but goes on to deeds. St. John's sentence, "Let us not love merely in word or with the tongue, but in action and reality" (1 Jn. 3:18) is an excellent commentary on "Let charity be unfeigned."

This charity, which is charity towards the neighbour, will be sincere, if it has two qualities of recoil or flight and of attraction or adhesion: "Detesting what is evil, solidly attached to what is good." Christian friendship is not the false friendship that encourages evil ways, but is rather a strong attachment to our neighbour's good, devotedness to his real goodness or his potential goodness. "Charity is not glad when injustice triumphs, it is glad when the truth prevails."

Two other conditions are necessary to the life of charity. It must be rooted in the affection of Christian fraternity. Pagans knew what we call "cameraderie," but they did not know the intimately cordial bond of Christian love. It amazed them and they said: "See how those Christians love one another." St. Paul required Christian "philadelpheia" to be "philostorgos," that is, "affectionate." The second condition touches on the great evangelical virtue of humility: "You should give preference to each other in honour (or appreciation)." This has been taken in the sense of forestalling each other with testimonies of regard, 'a competition of courtesy"—"una gara di cortesia." But the parallel passage in Philippians 2:3 should decide

the meaning. A Christian is always a strict censor over himself and is kindly appreciative of the merits of others, seeing God's gifts in them. Quoting Philippians 2:3 in this place: "In humility deem others better than yourselves," St. Thomas adds: "quod quidem fit, dum aliquis suum defectum considerat, et bonum proximi."

At this point the charity of which St. Paul is speaking seems to turn towards God, and we have a series of six beautiful and inspiring precepts.

The first: "(Be) not slothful in diligence" seems to correspond to the very definition of devotion given by St. Thomas Aquinas. "Devotion," he says, "seems to be nothing other than a will to give oneself promptly to what belongs to the service of God" (Summa, 2, 2 q. 82, a. 1). Indifference, nonchalance, laziness in serving God is something to be strenuously avoided. The five things that follow are a wonderful rule of Christian life. The order of words is suggestive, for the dative construed with the respective verb comes first in every case: "With the spirit—fervent; towards the Lord—(ready) servants; in hope—rejoicing, in tribulation—patient, in prayer—perservering." If we carry the five arguments for the existence of God on the tips of five fingers, we could do worse than assign this present pentad: fervour of spirit, service of the Lord, joy in hope, patience in tribulation, perserverance in prayer, to the fingers of the other hand. St. Thomas has a beautiful final comment, insisting especially on the importance of prayer: "By prayer diligence is stirred up in us, fervour is enkindled, we are incited to the service of God, the joy of hope is increased in us, and we secure help in tribulation."

Next, the Apostle turns once more to the special manifestations of fraternal charity. There is a pair—a parenthesis which seems to have been evoked by verbal association—then two other pairs of precepts, with which the first half of our passage ends.

"Take part in the needs of the saints" means "Make them your own." The needs of our neighbour become our own most thoroughly when we live by faith in the mystical body of Christ, realising that we are even *more* than members of one family in this tremendous mystic unity. The saints understood the fulness of that word of Christ: "What you did to the least of these little ones, you did to me."

The same doctrine: "What is done to them is done to Me" makes the Christian law of hospitality more a "pursuit" than a duty. "Pursue hospitality," says the Apostle. St. John Chrysostom comments: "You

must not be too concerned about knowing whom you are receiving, since it is Christ you are receiving." There comes to one's mind the beautiful lunette painted by Blessed Fra Angelico in San Marco at Florence in which two Dominican Friars, in the duty of hospitality, welcome our Lord Himself.

It seems that the verb *diōkein* used metaphorically in the phrase "Pursue hospitality" brought the idea of persecutors to the Apostle's mind, and with it the monitions of the sermon on the Mount: "Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse." The immediate change of construction into imperative (not sustained) seems to indicate that this is a parenthetic sentence with a wider horizon than the Christian community. The persecutors are surely not conceived as fellow-Christians. From the participial imperative St. Paul now slips into infinitival imperative:

(I say) "to rejoice with those who rejoice, to weep with those who weep." As Father Lagrange (in h.l.) notes: St. Chrysostom has the very verifiable observation that it is much more rare to rejoice in a Christian way with those who rejoice than to sorrow with those in sorrow. The Saint's remarks are rather long, but are well worth quoting: "Yes, it will be said (sympathy is understandable) but why ever did he command them the other thing, when it is no such great matter? Really, this requires more of a high Christian temper, to rejoice with those that rejoice, than to weep with those who weep. For this latter nature itself does as a matter of course; and there is none so stony-hearted as not to weep over him who is in misfortune; but the other requires a very noble soul, so as not only to keep from envying the one who is held in esteem but even to feel pleasure together with him. And this is why "to rejoice with those who rejoice" is placed first. For there is nothing that binds love so firmly as communication in one another's joys and sorrows. Do not, then, because you are out of difficulties yourself, keep away from sympathising. For when your neighbour is ill-treated, you ought to make the calamity your own. Share, therefore in his tears that you may lighten his discouragement; share in his joy that that joy may be more deeply rooted in his soul, that you may help to fix love firmly. You will be even of more service to yourself than to him in so doing, for by weeping you will become merciful, and by feeling his pleasure you will purge yourself of envy and grudging. But let me draw attention to St. Paul's well-considered words. He did not say: Take away the misery, lest you should reply,

as you often would be compelled: 'I cannot.' He enjoined an easier task, one entirely in your power. For even if you are unable to remove the evil, nevertheless contribute some tears and you have taken away the worst half. And if you are not able to increase the man's well-being, bring the contribution of your joy, which will be a great addition. To abstain from envy would be something, but St. Paul enjoins something greater, joining in the neighbour's joy and pleasure. This is greatly more than not envying." The fine psychology of this paragraph will be apparent to everybody.

Humility is always the foundation and support of charity. To keep an all-round equal-mindedness towards everybody—the same substantial human complacence towards all—requires a strong discipline of every form of upsurgent self. St. Paul requires this when he says: "Thinking the same towards each other," and he adds something which is characteristic of the religion of Christ: "Not having thoughts set on high things, but rather being drawn to lowly persons." This seems to be the sense of the Apostle's words. If there is a preference at all it is a preference for the poor—remember Bossuet's sermon on "the eminent dignity of the poor." Lagrange notes very pointedly at this place: "A true Christian finds himself more at home in garrets than in palaces."

* * * *

According to the division we have adopted, the second part begins here: "Do not be wise in your own eyes." This "being wise with oneself" would mean an autocratic spirit of judgment and of independence, the exclusion of which from the Christian Way would be a suitable preface to the precepts that immediately follow:

"To no man render evil for evil, but *be careful to observe becoming conduct in the eyes of all men.* If possible, as far as it depends on you, be at peace with all men. Do not take self-vindication into your own hands, dearly beloved, but give place to (God's) wrath. For it is written: *To Me belongs vindication, I will repay,* says the Lord. But, *if your enemy is hungry, give him food; if he is thirsty give him drink. For so doing you will heap coals of fire on his head.* Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good."

It is better to take this whole passage in a lump. The italics show that it borrows from three scriptural places. In the order of their occurrence the biblical citations are from Proverbs 3:4 (the Septuagint form of the text being adopted and somewhat changed from the original

Greek wording: "Provide good things before the Lord and men"), Deuteronomy 32:35 (the Great Canticle of Moses), and Proverbs 25:21f. This last citation is almost identical with both Septuagint and Hebrew. It is notable that the Deuteronomic quotation, which occurs in identical wording in Hebrew 10:30, does not exactly follow the Masoretic or the Septuagint, but is identical with the reading found in the Targum or Aramaic Paraphrase of Onqelos.

The inspiration of the sermon on the Mount is very evident in these lines. But the same peaceful disinterestedness and moderate feelings with regard to personal rights was taught to the Corinthians also by the Apostle in connection with the law-suits which some of the Christian community were bringing before pagan tribunals. To quote Father Lyonnet's excellent note (in.h.l.) in the Bible de Jerusalem: "The Apostle does not only exclude all desire of personal revenge (in the ordinary sense) but all conduct inspired by the sole care of securing one's rights. The opposition that he makes is not vengeance and justice, but 'justice-for-oneself' and charity, which is 'justice-for-others.' This 'justice-for-others' is the first duty of charity."

We have evidently in these five verses (17-21) a little code of Christian morality towards those outside. The situation contemplated is that of Pagan or Jewish hostility. To render evil for evil was condemned even by David in the Israel of the law of retaliation. It falls under the ban entirely in the retaliation-paragraph of the sermon on the Mount. St. Paul warned the Thessalonians against it in practically the same words as we read here (1 Thess. 5:17).

The admonition to show themselves an example of goodness to all men, expressed in the borrowed words of Proverbs, echoes to our Lord's admonition: "Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father Who is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16).

The vision of realities shows us that perfect all-round peace is somewhat of an impossibility in the world. Our Lord said that He had "not come to bring peace, but the sword." As far as possible—and the limits are not determined, unless the price is evil—the Christian is a disciple and an apostle of peace. He does all he can to establish and maintain it by use of possibilities, and even does all he can when the situation seems to be: "Impossible."

"Standing on one's rights" is a mentality which can greatly hinder peace. The willing surrender of *personal* rights in view of a higher

good is difficult for flesh and blood, and St. Paul seems to want to temper the difficulty with a word of endearment, when he says: "Don't take the vindication of your just cause into your own hands, dearly beloved." The Apostle is not contemplating the matter of public and social justice. A Christian may be bound by social obligation to vindicate his right. What he must do is to strain his cause free of self-vindication. He "gives place to God's anger," for the Christian seeking first the kingdom can rely on God's justice with regard to his own personal interests. This may sound a bit utopian, but the same standard was applied at Corinth: "It is altogether a defect in you that you have law suits among yourselves. Why do you not prefer to suffer wrong, to be defrauded?" It is just living the sermon on the Mount—letting your cloak go also to the man who wants to take your tunic. Banking in heaven involves unusual modes of conduct.

"Christian "revenge" is that of well-doing. Beneficence towards a hostile person requires prudence, but if the enemy is in need, hungry or thirsty, for instance, he is to be helped. Those kindnesses will be as painful as coals of fire to him, but they will be the medicinal pains of sorrow and remorse for his hostility.

As Father Lyonnet points out (in.h.l.): It is egoism in ourselves and about us that is the one great enemy. The way to triumph over it is to take seriously, and adopt strenuously, St. Paul's strategy of victory: "Do not let yourself be overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good."

W. LEONARD.

Notes

THE PILTDOWN FORGERY

The news of the death of Father Teilhard de Chardin re-awakens our interest in a most audacious anthropological forgery; for he had long been known as one of those closely connected with the discovery. The publication last year of an authoritative account[1] of the exposure of the forgery by one of the principals in that investigation provides us at last with a clear picture of the events and enables us to assess the parts played by each of the participants in the original discoveries.

In late 1912 the "Manchester Guardian" carried the first public announcement of the discoveries made at Piltdown, near Hastings, in Sussex. This was followed by a public lecture to the Geological Society in which a geologist, Charles Dawson, described how he had noticed that the gravel repairs on a road were being made with some unusual brown flints; on enquiry, he found these came from a gravel bed on a nearby farm, Barkham Manor; he asked the workmen to notify him of any fossils or bones they found. On a subsequent visit they handed him a small portion of an unusually thick parietal bone. Some years later, in the autumn of 1911, he himself found another piece of skull, and gradually from nine such pieces discovered, a skull was fitted together. There was also found a fragment of lower jaw with first and second teeth still in place. A well-known anatomist, Arthur Woodward, concluded that the skull was essentially human, while the mandible appeared to be that of an ape, with nothing human except the molar teeth. He was satisfied that this unique fossil represented by apish jaw and human brain-case merited its own place in the zoological scheme; it was thought that it gave a good picture of the stage of ancestry which man had reached perhaps 500,000 years ago.

At this meeting of the Geological Society there was great enthusiasm and acclaim for Dawson. A few members, however, demurred. One of six speakers in the discussion that followed was David Waterson, Professor of Anatomy at King's College; he found it hard to conceive of a functional association between a jaw so similar to that of a chimpanzee and a cranium in all essentials human. He found it difficult

[1]The Piltdown Forgery, by J. S. Weiner. Oxford University Press, London. 1955.

to believe that the two parts came from the same individual and thought that the jaw was the older, belonging to the Pliocene, while the skull was Pleistocene.

Arthur Keith drew attention to a crucial point; there was no eye-tooth in the jaw. What sort of a canine would such a creature possess? Woodward replied that like the wear on the molars, the canine tooth would be worn down in a way expected from a freely-moving jaw such as the Piltdown man must clearly have possessed in view of its association with so human a cranium. There followed next year an intensive search in the gravel for the missing tooth. On Saturday, August 30th, the young priest, Father Teilhard de Chardin found the canine close to the spot whence the lower jaw itself had been disinterred. The eye-tooth was just what was hoped for and closely fulfilled Woodward's prediction of its shape, size, and above all of the nature of its wear; it was of the same uniform brown colouring as the rest of the fragments.

The next year's excavation yielded what Keith called "the most amazing of all the Piltdown revelations." Digging a few feet from the place where the Piltdown skull had first been found, the workman who was with Woodward and Dawson exposed a fossil slab of elephant bone, which had been artificially shaped to form a club-like implement. Flints had been found earlier which, it was argued, were human-fashioned, so now to the Piltdown man's kit of stone tools had been added the earliest known bone implement.

In 1915, the year before Dawson's death, the last and perhaps the most conclusive of the Piltdown discoveries was announced: he had found the remains of yet another individual two miles away; at this second site, at Sheffield Park, there were parts of a brain-case and a molar tooth quite like those previously found. Those who had held that there were two different creatures involved in the Barkham Manor remains could scarcely say that the same thing had happened again, so this second discovery had the effect of converting most sceptics; thus the leading French anthropologist, Marcellin Boule, changed his view when after the war he learnt of the second discovery; the American Fairfield Osborn also.

It had long been known that the amount of fluorine in fossil bones increases with their age, but only in 1949 was this test applied to the Piltdown specimens; the results were astonishing. The fluorine accumulation was so small that the bones could be given a dating hardly

later than 50,000 years and they all appeared to be of the same date. It was discovered independently that the gravel bed in which the first remains had been found was not nearly so ancient as at first believed.

From discussions at a dinner of palaeontologists in London in July, 1953, Drs. Weiner and Oakley and Professor Le Gros Clark decided to test the hypothesis that the Piltdown remains were a deliberate fraud. An improved technique for the fluorine tests established the cranium as Late Ice Age—as had the tests of 1949—but the jaw and three teeth gave a much lower figure well within the range of values for modern specimens. These tests indicated clearly, both in the case of the original Barkham Manor remains and of those at Sheffield Park, that the crania do not belong to the jaw and teeth, and that the jaw and teeth are more recent. In these days physicists have provided archaeologists and palaeontologists with many tests to help them solve their problems. To the Piltdown remains were applied tests for nitrogen, collagen, organic carbon and chemically-bound water; all these confirmed the fluorine tests and demonstrated conclusively the modernity of the jaw and the teeth.

But a modern ape's jaw would not be the rich brown colour of these fragments. It was found that the colour was only on the outer layers of the bone of the jaw—suggesting that it had not long been in the iron-stained mud of the district; the cranium was uniformly stained throughout. The suspicion that some deliberate artificial staining had taken place was confirmed by finding that the canine tooth had been stained by the well-known paint, Vandyke Brown. It is probable that Red Sienna also was applied; and these were in addition to the immersion of the fragments in bichromate of potash.

A detailed dental examination revealed that the teeth had been artificially filed down, and the eye-tooth was that of an individual much younger than would have been possible from that amount of natural wear. (A dentist named Lyne had made this latter point in 1916, but had been brushed aside by Woodward and the dental expert, Dr. Underwood.) The roots of the molar teeth are quite consonant with those of an ape and the earlier contention that they were located in the jaw in the same way as human teeth was due to very poor original X-rays, and faulty reading of these.

Anatomical examination convinced the experts that the jaw was not that of a chimpanzee, as the first critics of the Piltdown man had claimed, but that of an orang-utan. Frassetto had suggested this first

in 1927, then later Friederichs and Weidenreich.

There had been eighteen fragments of bone found at the site and these were alleged to be the remains of animals contemporary with the Piltdown man. Again, artificial staining was established and in the case of the elephant teeth it seems that they were imported from Tunisia. Ten of the eighteen fragments are unquestionably frauds and there are strong grounds for believing that this is also true of the remainder. The so-called tools of the Piltdown man are likewise now believed to have been importations and the bone club to have been whittled down with a knife and stained.

The conclusions from these investigations: The two Piltdown "men" were forgeries, the tools were falsifications, and even the animal remains were planted. The question is, who was responsible?

The three principal actors in the drama were Woodward, Father Teilhard de Chardin, and Dawson. Woodward was the expert to whom Dawson turned; they had been friends for years, and Woodward remained a staunch defender of the Piltdown man all his days. We deplore the omissions and inaccuracies in his recountal of events and the difficulties he has left in the way of our understanding certain crucial matters; thus he knew that some staining had taken place by means of bichromate of potash, but he too easily accepted Dawson's explanation that this had been done to the first pieces only and in the mistaken idea that it would harden the bones for their better preservation. He does not, however, tell us of the time and the circumstances of his becoming aware of this staining. We can be critical of his failure to have the jaw analysed as the cranium had been. He was a busy man, which is some extenuation for lack of thoroughness in this investigation. He did not make the discoveries, but was called in long after the first ones to give his verdict upon them. It appears quite certain that he was completely taken in and had no conscious part in the great hoax.

Father Teilhard de Chardin was one of the co-discoverers. He had come to Hastings in 1908 after a period in Egypt, and before that in Jersey. Accompanied by his older Jesuit friend, Father Felix Pelletier, he was looking for fossils in a quarry in the spring or summer of 1909 when he first met Dawson. On that first meeting the latter revealed the exciting news of his find at Piltdown. In June 1912, Father Teilhard was with Woodward when the latter first saw the fragments. It was the young Jesuit who found several fragments including the

all-important eye-tooth on 30th August, 1913. In October of that year he was back in France, served as a chaplain with the French forces during the war and did not return to England for some years.

Like Woodward, he also is completely absolved from any conscious part in the hoax. He alone of the principals was alive when in 1953 the forgery was uncovered, and to him the idea that either Dawson or Woodward was in any way wittingly implicated in this business was completely unthinkable. He held both these men in the greatest respect, and indeed was inclined to doubt whether a real hoax had occurred at all. It seemed to him not impossible that the pit at Piltdown was used as a rubbish dump where, over a course of years, all sorts of objects including bones from some discarded collection could have been deposited; the heavily iron bearing water of the gravel would soon stain the bones dark brown. However, enquiries in the locality lend no support to this theory of a rubbish dump.

Nor will any other explanation save the principal actor in the drama of Piltdown, Charles Dawson, from the grave suspicion of a long sustained fraud. Closer examination shows many inaccuracies in his reports, notably on the number of skull fragments found; most serious is his failure ever to indicate the exact location of the finding of the second Piltdown man at Sheffield Park. While he enjoyed a good reputation among the country's leading men of science, locally at Lewes he was not popular. He had the reputation of the "Sussex Wizard"—an investigator into all kinds of strange phenomena, but not a careful and painstaking recorder of details. His "History of Hastings Castle" was early recognised as less a product of genuine scholarship than of extensive plagiarism. Two of his contemporaries, Major Marriott and Captain Guy St. Barbe, caught him staining bones and flints—the latter made this known after the exposure. A rival archaeologist, Harry Morris. left among his possessions a flint inscribed: "Stained by C. Dawson with intent to defraud (all)—H.M." It seems impossible to escape the conclusion[2] that Dawson "was salting the mine"—providing the fossils from his collections, preparing them and planting them to be found by himself and others.

The Piltdown Down man had been reconstructed in hundreds of museums in many lands; he was represented as a stupid-looking brutish character mid-way between man and the ape. He should now be taken

[2]Weiner concludes (op. cit. p 204): "Our verdict as to the authorship must rest on suspicion and not proof." He also records (p. 188), Mrs. Dawson as saying she felt that her husband before his death had some important information he wanted to pass on.

down from his dubious pedestal and placed with the other fakes of evolutionary history. No one doubts that most of the painfully gathered collection of fossils are perfectly genuine. But it is well to recall how little of the reconstructed "men" depends on the fossil record and how much is due to the vivid imagination of anthropologists and museum sculptors. From the skull it is quite impossible to reconstruct the character of hair, eyes, nose, lips, ears, eyebrows, expression of the face, etc. Yet these are continually represented with an interpretation suited to evolutionary ideas. The fact that the Piltdown man fooled the scientific world for forty years must make us more doubtful of radical evolutionary claims. We notice that many ardent evolutionists —among them Dr. Weiner[3]—are now claiming that the elimination of the Piltdown man makes the evolutionary picture clearer, because with his human cranium and undeveloped jaw, he ran counter to recent opinion which considers that the jaw was the first part to assume human characteristics. What is not stressed is that even as late as 1944 many evolutionists, including Sir Arthur Keith and Woodward, were prepared to pin their faith to the Piltdown man in opposition to all other fossil remains as the most likely ancestor of man.

We are still awaiting the day when modern dating tests will have been carefully applied to all known fossils. Present indications are that some of the fossils of men of modern type, e.g., those of Kanam and Kanjera in Africa, are just as old as the alleged evolutionary types of African ape-man (Australopithecus) and the Peking man; among European fossils the modern type Swanscombe man is as old as the earliest of the evolutionary claims—the Heidelberg man.

Surely the most reasonable position is one of caution. It must be acknowledged that current ideas about evolution are bound to be modified and will be supplanted by much more accurate ones in the years to come.

F. A. MECHAM.

* * * *

NOTICE

The appointment of a Lecturer in Moral Theology in the Theological Faculty at St. Patrick's College, Manly, may be made as from the beginning of the academic year 1957. Applications, together with Testimonials and a Letter from each candidate's Bishop, should reach the President before October 1st.

JAMES MADDEN,
President.

1st July, 1956.

[3]Op. Cit. p. 204.

Book Reviews

NEGLECTED SAINTS, by E. I. Watkin. Sheed and Ward. 241 pp. 12/6 in England.

Mr. Watkin thinks that modern man is peculiarly in need of reading the lives of the Saints. For centuries he has given his attention exclusively to the created world and lost sight of the Creator. He has cultivated, in Mr. Watkin's phrase, breadth-knowledge at the expense of depth-knowledge, and so lives in spiritual darkness. As the Saint is an expert in depth-knowledge, he can teach us much about this lost world.

Only a few of the Church's huge army of Saints are well known; and as each presents sanctity to us in a slightly different form, it is a good thing to extend our knowledge to as many as possible. So the author gives sketches of nine little known or neglected Saints—Saints Martin of Tours, Hugh of Lincoln, Bruno, Thomas of Villanueva, Blessed John of Montmirail, Jordan of Saxony, Diana d'Andalo, Osanna of Mantua, and Anthony Grassi. Spain, France, England, Germany and Italy are the scenes of these lives, which stretch from the fourth to the seventeenth centuries.

They are lives of considerable variety and interest; the active and contemplative are represented. Mr. Watkin is able to point to many ways in which these lives have a relevance to the post-war world but his narrative is unfortunately slow in movement, and his moralising at times both trite and intrusive.

V.M.

* * * *

THE MYSTICAL ROSE—thoughts on the Blessed Virgin from the writings of J. H. Newman, edited by Joseph Regina, S.T.D. Browne & Nolan Ltd. A St. Paul publication—London, 1955. 144 pp. 8/-.

This selection from his writings on Our Lady, forms the Mariology of the great Cardinal, John Henry Newman. The work is divided into two parts. The first section (up to p. 48) is taken from the "Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey" (found in "Difficulties for Anglicans" Vol. 11). A knowledge of the controversy between Drs. Pusey and Newman is not necessary to understand this section, as it is a plain exposition of the Catholic doctrine about Our Lady, which Newman demonstrates is not an innovation but is irrefutably founded in the sources of Revelation. His thesis is based on an excellently presented distinction between 'faith' and 'devotion'. Faith in Mary has never waned; it is only devotion to her that has fluctuated. The Cardinal's collection of texts, concerning Our Lady, from the Fathers, besides its apologetical value, forms an inestimable mine of knowledge from which the student can borrow.

The second section (pp. 49-144) constitutes what may be called meditations on the Litany of Loretto. The sources are two, namely:

"Discourses to Mixed Congregations" and "Meditations and Devotions," published posthumously in 1893 by Fr. Neville at the Oratory.

This section reveals as clearly as the solar luminary, the literary genius of Newman. Gripped as we are by his power and strength of his words, we can see beneath them the profound and sincerely religious soul of a noble character.

This book is intended both for study and devotion. Considered as a book of devotion, as "a practical guide to help the faithful to spend a month or period of time with Mary . . . particularly the month of May," the editor has successfully achieved his aim. But considered as a book for study he has failed!

One has only to compare this book to "The New Eve" (published by the Oxford Press), which covers the same ground as the first section of this work, to note its deficiencies. Whereas "The New Eve" abounds in classical references and foot-notes, especially on the texts of the Fathers, the "Mystical Rose" entirely lacks the same, thus retarding, not facilitating, the student's work.

Many defects detract from the book. The dust-cover, attractive in itself, contains an error twice repeated; the Cardinal is called H. J. Newman instead of J. H. Newman.

P. 28 contains these typographical errors: 'idealf' for 'ideal' and 'wonded' for 'wonder'.

On P. 89, 'Mater Admirabilis' appears where one should find 'Mater Amabilis'.

The reviewer's copy contains a fault of binding. One reaches p. 127 and finds a repetition of pp. 120-127; not a simple repetition for on the 'second' p. 121 we find under 'Turris Eburnea' 13 lines that in fact belong to the real p. 121 under the title of 'Vas Spirituale'.

Again on p. 130, lines 14 and 15 form a 'non-sequitur' because of an omission of two lines in the original (cf. 'Meditations and Devotions' p. 61-62, Longman and Green Co. 1953).

However, the reviewer has found that his copy is a singularly defective one, other copies of this work do not labour under these defects. If any one is looking for a book to stimulate devotion to Our Lady, this one is recommended as an excellent point of departure.

D.B.H.

* * * *

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY IN THE MIDDLE AGES, by Etienne Gilson. London, Sheed and Ward, 1955. Pp. xviii, 829. Two guineas sterling.

At last we have in English not merely a translation but the author's own much-revised version of the best of all histories of medieval philosophy, Gilson's *La philosophie au Moyen Age*. The core of both books, the series of accounts of the doctrines of individual philosophers, is for the most part textually the same. Still the two books are very different. The French version contains many chapters, omitted in the

English, setting the history of philosophy in perspective against the literary and cultural background of the age. Many will be sorry to see so much, about a quarter of the original text, sacrificed in the interests of mere erudition. But those who deplored the absence of references and discussions of detailed problems from the original version will be delighted to find that the mere trivia of literary curiosity have been ousted by the overwhelming forces of more than two hundred and fifty pages of notes, marshalled in double columns of the smallest type. In addition, the English version is much better arranged and subdivided than the French, while there is at least one substantial addition to the text, namely the section on Avicenna.

It is not within my competence to quarrel with M. Gilson's opinions, and it is hardly necessary to insist on his standing as a philosopher, an historian and a writer. His English is clear and idiomatic. The publishers have treated the author handsomely in printing, paper and binding without unduly raising the price of the book, which, all things considered, is extremely reasonable. Nobody who has any serious interest in Christian philosophy, or even theology, can afford to pass this book by. It is unique.

J.B.

* * * *

"WHAT CATHOLICS BELIEVE," by Josef Pieper and Heinz Raskop. Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., London, 1954. xi, 144 pages (incl. index). Australian Price, 15/6.

"What Catholics Believe" is a translation of the German "Christenfibel," made by Christopher Huntington. The book, which gives a summary of What Catholics Believe, while embracing all the chief doctrines of the Catholic Church, gives a brief and simple explanation of each.

The book can be conveniently divided into two parts; the first, dealing with the Faith of the Christian, tells us what Faith is, and then expounds each clause of the Apostles Creed in detail, at the same time showing how they form a simplified system of doctrine. But Faith is also a way of life; hence the second part of the book deals with the life of a Catholic; the Sacraments receive special attention, both individually and as a body, showing their relation to the Spiritual life of man.

Having devoted a short section to the Liturgical Year and its importance, the author goes on to treat of the Virtues, Theological and Cardinal, and their necessity in the life of a Christian. The Catholic Faith is based on Supernatural Revelation, thus some space is devoted to Sacred Scripture, its nature, importance and relation to the Faith. The book concludes with some remarks on Church History, showing the development and expansion of the Church from the time of the Apostles.

Throughout the matter is systematically arranged and the style is simple; we may say it is written by a layman, but not exclusively for laymen.

As Fr. D'Arcy says in his foreword:

"This work will refresh the minds of Catholics at the same time as it offers to all an unexpected and congenial presentation of What Catholics Believe."

J.F.S.

* * * *

THE CONGREGATION OF SACRED RITES, by Rev. Frederick R. McManus, A.B., J.C.L., and

THE BETROTHAL CONTRACT IN THE CODE OF CANON LAW (Canon 1017), by Chester F. Wrzaszczak, A.B., S.T.L., J.C.L. Catholic University of America Press, Washington, U.S.A.. 1954. 2 doll. each.

The publication of Theses submitted to the Faculty of the School of Canon Law of the Catholic University of America, in partial fulfilment for the degree of Doctor of Canon Law, is awaited with interest each year by all interested in canonical questions. Over the years a steady output has been maintained with the result that the student engaged in research and the canonist grappling with the problems of everyday life have at hand a vast body of information covering almost every aspect of Church Law. Any reference library, which possesses the complete series of these Theses, must be considered as very well equipped. The student and canonist, who enjoys such facilities, is indeed fortunate.

The first Dissertation mentioned above was published in 1954, prior to the revision of the rubrics of the Missal and the Breviary and the Restored Order of Holy Week, both of which were announced last year. The Thesis is timely as the words of the Foreword indicate:

> "The first half of the present century has been a period of liturgical revival, initiated by Pope Pius X and extended even more widely by the present Holy Father. In this a principal part belongs to the Congregation of Sacred Rites, and it may be expected that the Congregation, largely because of its control of the amendment of the liturgical books will have an increasing importance in the future".

The introductory chapter is devoted to an explanation of liturgical law. After a detailed account of the history of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, which is contained in the second chapter, subsequent chapters deal with the authority and competence of the Congregation, its constitution and procedure, and the obligations imposed by its decrees. The author pays due tribute to the judicial power of the Congregation with regard to causes of the Servants of God. The special value of this Dissertation lies in the fact that it gives an objective and scientific statement on the role of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, and because of this it will help the liturgists in their understanding and exposition of liturgical law.

The second Dissertation, as its title indicates, deals with the Betrothal Contract. In the foreword it is mentioned that, in the extra-

ordinary circumstances of the last war, solemn engagements were revived in certain quarters of America. In the present circumstances the author suggests:

"A widespread revival would indeed aid somewhat in stemming the awful tide of betrayed love and broken lives."

The plan follows traditional lines. The first part traces the historical development of Betrothal Contracts. The second section gives a competent and comprehensive commentary on present legislation. An unusual feature throughout is the division of each chapter into sections. The whole of the commentary on Canon 1017 is made up of one Chapter, which in turn consists of seven sections. The whole of the chapter runs into 140 pages. The various formularies for espousals are set out clearly. Perhaps they would have been more accessible if incorporated in the appendices rather than in the actual text.

The author has achieved his objective in giving a detailed and scientific commentary on Canon 1017. Whether the Betrothal Contract will be re-introduced to any extent must, however, remain a matter for conjecture.

T.J.C.

* * * *

THE WESTERN DILEMMA, by Alan Gordon Smith. Longmans, Green, London, 1954. 186 pp. Price in Australia, 14/6.

We are continually being told that certain Western values are in jeopardy to-day. What are these Western values? How are they to be defended? These questions are answered in the book under review.

The author begins by pointing out that the present peril to our Western civilisation cannot be averted by mere military measures, by helping backward peoples or any other purely material expedients. The means of salvation must be spiritual, nothing less than unwavering faith in Western values, namely, "respect for personal rights, impartial justice between man and man, the equality in worth of all human souls". These values are not "supernatural" in themselves—they could be known by unaided human reason. In practice, however, they originated with Christianity, and the only effective way of defending them against the onrush of Soviet barbarism is by intellectually rehabilitating Christian faith, the rational basis of which has been discredited by Luther and others since the sixteenth century.

But how can one restore the rational basis of Christianity, when modern philosophers claim to have discredited reason itself? The author, in reply, sets out from first principles to re-instate reason on its throne. The first half of the book is devoted to this purpose. The other half then goes on to establish the truth of Christianity by showing how Christ's prophecies about his kingdom on earth are marvellously fulfilled in the Catholic Church. But, surely, Christ's miracles (including His resurrection) also provide sufficient grounds for belief—even in our days?

In general, the book is well written, and undertakes a very urgent

task for these uncertain times. The credentials of the Catholic Church are persuasively presented, but not all readrs will agree entirely with the philosophical approach to the subject.

T.V.F.

* * * *

THE MONGOL MISSION. Edited by Christopher Dawson for "The Makers of Christendom" Series. Sheed and Ward. Price in England, 18/-. 237 pages.

This book consists mainly of two long reports by Franciscan friars on their journeys to Mongolia in the 13th century. There are also a few shorter pieces on similar journeys made a little later.

The Mongols obsessed the thoughts of public-minded men of Central and Eastern Europe in the 13th century as the Turks were to do in the 15th and the Bolsheviks later still. They appeared on the fringes of Europe in 1222, sent by that terrible military genius, Chingis or Genghis Khan. Fortunately for Europe they turned back from Southern Russia to the East. They re-appeared in 1236 in Russia, taking city after city in overwhelming rushes, massacring the inhabitants. Four years later they had burst through the frontiers of Poland and Hungary, destroying and killing everything in their path. They were in what is to-day Yugo-Slavia and in Austria when the death of their king halted them, and they withdrew to Russia. Their ruthlessness, the velocity and force of their attack inspired terror in Central Europe, and two parties of Franciscan friars needed superhuman courage to accept a mission to the capital of the Mongols within a few years of their conquest of Hungary and Poland.

In 1245 sixty-five year old John of Plano Carpini and a companion were sent by Pope Innocent IV to announce the gospel to the Mongols and to admonish their Khan for the destruction wrought in Christian countries. On his return, John set down an account of the mission and of the Mongols. He started from Poland early in 1246 and penetrated into Mongolia to the Khan's great camp at Karakorum, the capital. He was back in Kiev in June, 1247. The report he made, covering 70 pages of this volume, contains a detailed account of the Mongol way of life, religion, and morals: a somewhat fanciful history of their race: and an exciting narrative of his own adventures.

But for interest and excitement he must take second place to Friar William of Rubruck, who made the same journey on behalf of Louis IX of France, setting out from Constantinople in May, 1253. Friar William had a sharper eye, especially for personalities; and he has left a wonderful picture of the court of Mangu Khan in Karakorum, the weird mixture of pagan, Moslem and Nestorian religions which obtained in that place. The journey across the Volga into Turkestan and the borders of China and Mongolia is described with vividness and power. Then he reaches the capital, has an interview with the Emperor (or Khan) and is let remain for some months. During that time his eye took in everything, emperor, imperial wives, ministers, magicians, and

servants, the customs of the Mongols and their morals, the doctrine and liturgy, both equally chaotic, of the Nestorians. Above all there is the unforgettable picture of Sergius, the Armenian monk, a weaver, passing himself off as a priest, childishly cunning, childishly conceited at a sign of imperial favour, speechless and appalled at an imperial rebuke, terrified at the possible consequences of his own rash boasting to the Khan—if I don't cure her, you may cut off my head—grabbing presents refused by the Franciscans, helping Friar William with advice and upsetting his stomach with rhubarb-juice, incorrigible and indefatigable, he is a fascinating ecclesiastical confidence-man.

There is a long and informative introduction by Mr. Christopher Dawson and a rather inaccurately drawn map.

V.M.

* * * *